

25
~~704.0.24~~
~~4~~

A
FARTHER ILLUSTRATION
OF THE
ANALYSIS;
IN ANSWER
TO
SOME FOREIGN OBSERVATIONS.

by Jacob Bryant

Αρχη της φλυαριας ὑμιν γεγονασιν οἱ Γραμματικοί.

Tatiani Assyrii Oratio contra Græcos. p. 266

M.DCC.LXXVIII.



P R E F A C E.

IT was the opinion of some of my best friends, that I ought not to answer my unknown opponent: as his censures were not of consequence, and his behaviour too illiberal to merit any notice. Besides, whoever enters the lists with an anonymous enemy, undoubtedly engages upon very unequal terms. Notwithstanding this I could not refrain myself from writing down my mind on the occasion: and though I have been so far restrained by the kind advice given me, as not to publish my thoughts at large to the world; yet I imagined, there could be no impropriety in presenting a few copies of that, which I had drawn up, to my principal acquaintance. And I was the more induced to disclose my mind in this manner, as by obviating the censures above-mentioned I had an opportunity afforded me of still farther illustrating my principles. Besides this, if the objections of my adversary

fary should in any instance have had undue weight; it would be in my power to take off that improper influence; and confirm the good opinion of many friends; whose favour and friendship are the greatest happiness of my life.

A

FARTHER ILLUSTRATION

OF THE

A N A L Y S I S, &c.

WHEN I sat down to compose the work which I have since sent into the world, it appeared to me, that most of the Assyrian, and Chaldaic names were an assemblage of titles; which often occurred out of composition; and from thence their meaning might be ascertained. And I thought, that I could observe the same in those of Egypt, and of other countries. In this I was countenanced by the opinions of Bayer, Selden, Bochart, and the great Sir Isaac Newton. Upon a nearer view there seemed reason to think, that this obtained not only in the names of persons, but of places: for I laid it down, as a fixed principle; that all such names had originally a meaning: and that there was certainly in them a reference either to situation, or religion, or to the people, by whom they were denominated. Upon this I set about the investigation of those first principles: and gave a list of some few elements; of which I thought many

ancient names were composed; and into which they might by a very fair analysis be resolved. And in this operation I often ran counter to the received rules of Grecian etymology, as warranted by grammarians. For I had considered them of old: and though they might have their use in the instructing of young persons; yet they were in many instances fallacious, and arbitrary; being founded neither in reason nor truth. At the same time I suspected, that this way of proceeding would necessarily raise me some enemies: and my suspicions have been warranted by the event. An anonymous writer, a person of undoubted learning, who has undertaken to give an account of the yearly productions in literature, has among others mentioned my work: and very little to its advantage. His strictures are chiefly confined to what I have said upon etymology: for though he condemns the whole, yet he considers only a part; thinking very politickly, that though the poison be infused at an extremity, yet the nobler parts will be ultimately tainted and ruined. But he has made a mistake at the very beginning: for my chief system does not at all depend upon etymology; though it may be in some degree illustrated by it. It stands quite independant; and is supported by far other principles: so that his arrows have been sped to little purpose: as the main object remains sound and unimpaired: nor indeed has he thought it worthy of his notice. However as he is very severe in his strictures upon that part, which he has taken in hand to consider; and has accused me of blindness, temerity, and ignorance: I will take a calm review of the principal parts of his censures; and then leave it to the reader to judge of the truth of his allegations. It shall be my endeavour to shew, that he is himself misled greatly

greatly by abiding by rules, which are no rules ; and by precedents, which have no validity. As his beginning will shew, with how unfavourable a disposition he sets out ; I will produce it at large, and then proceed to those particulars, which are the principal objects of his notice.

Epicurus, cum novam philosophiæ sectam conderet, duobus maxime usus est artificiis : altero ut ipse se profiteretur sapientem, et antiquos philosophos, ne Democrito quidem, a quo plurimum profecerat, excepto, insaniisse diceret : altero, ut ab eodem Democrito excogitatas atomos sumeret, seu corpuscula minutissima, et individua, sed concreta tamen, et variis figuris, hamata, uncinata, fingeretque ea ab æterno ad rectos angulos mota fuisse, donec forte et casu ab hoc motu deflecterent, coïrent, cohærerent, ita ut animalia, plantæ, et omnia procrearentur. Cujus opinionis inanitas etiam si nemini non sponte in oculos incurrat, tamen eadem ratio, cum ad alias doctrinas adhibetur, non ita attenditur, atque animadvertitur. At nuper adeo hujus rei documentum habuimus Bryantii librum, ab hominibus doctis haud paucis laudatum probatumque : quamquam eo consilio scriptus esse videatur, ut Epicurea temeritas, dudum ex philosophicis studiis explosa, in antiquæ historiæ et grammatices rationem induceretur. Nam et Bryantius passim veterum in his rebus ignorantiam exagitat ; suam scientiam jactat : et vel ab aliis sumpsit, vel ipse finxit, ingentem vim atomorum, seu elementorum primævæ linguæ, ex iisque versando, commiscendoque, vetustissimarum gentium historiam construxit.

I should little have thought, that I could possibly have been compared to Epicurus : the whole scope of my system being in favour of religion in general ; and of the Mosaic history in particular ;

and quite opposite to the purpose and doctrine of that philosopher. But my ingenious opponent has found out a resemblance; and says, that my design appears to have been the introduction of the idle notions of this person. That like him I have made a jumble of atoms and elements, without number; and from these have endeavoured to form an history of nations. And while I am prosecuting this my purpose, I am continually exposing the ignorance of the ancients, and making an idle parade of my own knowledge and learning. As my work is in the hands of many persons of rank and learning, I must leave it to them to judge of these illiberal censures. In respect to Epicurus, whose notions I am supposed to have closely copied; I protest, during the whole course of my writing, I do not know, that I had him once in my thoughts. Indeed what inducement could there be? Both his purpose and mode of operation being the very reverse of mine. From an imaginary concourse of atoms he pretended to compound matter. I frame nothing. What I treat of is ready composed to my hands. My business is merely to shew its original principles. This writer therefore has certainly taken compounding and analysing for the same: in consequence of which he has made the comparison above; fancying that he saw a similitude where there was the greatest difference. He farther speaks of this part of my plan as in its very nature absurd, and even dangerous: and he accordingly accuses me of rashness for proceeding in such a course, and after such a master. Yet the whole of my process amounts to this only. I imagined, as I before said, that the names of men, and likewise of places, were of old compounded: and I endeavoured to find out their constituent parts. Can he possibly be ignorant, that
the

the names of regions and cities are at this day formed after the same manner : and that one half of them are made up of similar principles. Let him consider those, which may be most familiar to him, such as Dunkirk, Ostend, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Sandwic, Mardike, Herenhausen, Buckholt, Rheinweald : Add to these, Utrecht, Coblentz, Falkenberg, Francfort, Copenhagen, Warburgh, Wurtzburgh, Ravensburgh, Koningsburgh, Peterburgh. Are not these composed of particular terms : and may they not without any difficulty or danger be reduced to their original principles ? The like obtained among places of old : and I have given a syllabus of those elements, of which they seem chiefly to be composed. Whether I have made a right application, is not here to the purpose. There they stand, obvious and intelligible : and they do not amount in the whole to fifty. What possible connexion can they have with the system of Epicurus ? And how can this writer out of so small a number form, *ingentem vim, a prodigious assemblage*, and make them border upon infinity ? Yet this he does by comparing them to the atoms of that philosopher : and he seems to dread some evil consequence, which may ensue. But his fears are as imaginary as the atoms, of which he treats. No possible evil can proceed, from any thing, that I have advanced. He goes on to inform the world, that upon these principles I have formed an history of ancient nations. But I never entertained any such purpose : the very words, which he immediately quotes from me, will shew ; that at most it was the origin and not the history, which I took in hand. *Propositum nobis est infantiam atque incunabula gentium——prodere.* p. 55. And even in this little abstract he does not keep up to my

B 3

meaning.

meaning. The true passage is as follows. *It is my purpose in the ensuing work to give an account of the first ages; and of the great events, which happened in the infancy of the world.* Preface p. 1. No mention is here made of the *history* of ancient nations; nor are *nations* at all included. I meddle not with the laws and customs; with the wars and alliances, nor with any of those subsequent events, with which the history of the world is made up. The occurrences, of which I treat, were many of them prior to the very migration of families, and the peopling of the earth. But he not only insists, that I have composed an history upon this subject; but that I have founded it upon these elements and atoms, of which he has said so much. But this is manifestly untrue, as must appear to any person the least conversant in my work: and it is expressly contrary to my own words. What I had said about these elements I submitted with diffidence to the reader: and I then closed with these remarkable words. *If it should appear, that the grounds, on which I proceed, are good, and my method clear and warrantable, the subsequent histories will in consequence of it receive great illustration. But should it be my misfortune to have my system be thought precarious, or contrary to the truth; let it be placed to no account, but be totally set aside; as the history will speak for itself, and may without these helps be authenticated.* p. 215.

After this comes an account of the first part of my work; but it is by no means represented in that fair and candid way, which might have been expected from a person of learning. My sentiments are mentioned; but in a tumultuary manner, being deprived of their first order and arrangement, and destitute of those numerous evidences, with which they were originally accompanied.

Hence

Hence what I have said, must appear not only erroneous, but even ridiculous, to those persons, who receive my ideas through this faulty and confused medium. I am sorry to say, that he not only takes pains to place things in the most unfavourable light : but he often advances, what, I should think, he must have known to be not true. Thus he accuses me (p. 59.) of having transplanted the people of Ammonia Libyca : of placing them in Asia ; and raising them to an unwarrantable degree of glory. *Régionem gentemque Ammoniam Libyæ novimus : eam vero in Asiam induxit, et ad tantam dignitatem evexit, nemo ante Bryantium.* p. 59. Now through the whole series of my writings I do not recollect, that I once mention this people : much less do I remove them to other parts ; or speak of their elevation and dignity. The family, of whom I speak, consisted of the sons of Ham collectively. They held the founder of their race in idolatrous veneration : and as they styled him Amon rather than Ham ; I have spoken of them in consequence of it by the name of Amonians. And this was no secret to this writer : p. 56 : though he does not quote my words truly. *Itaque cum totus hic populus communem avum divino honore coleret, Solemque et Ammonem, vocaret, factum est, ut communis nomine Ammonæi nominarentur.* This, though not precisely related, yet will shew, how very unfairly he deals with me. And even here there is a mistake upon mistake : for I never said, that they were really so called ; but gave them the name myself for the reason above related. Nor did I raise them to any degree of grandeur, nor transplant them at my will, as this writer supposes. Three parts out of four of this family may in great measure be at rest for me. My principal business is with the sons

of Chus. Upon their history I chiefly found my system : and a wonderful history it is ; however my learned friend may neglect or despise it. In another place he speaks of my ignorance and blindness ; particularly in having recourse to a quotation ; which, he says, makes as much against me, as for me. Deinde, quod sæpius jactat Eustathii dictum, *ει βαρβαρον το ονομα, ου χρη ζητειν Ἑλληνικην ετυμολογιαυ αυτε*, illud reciprocari non sensisse videtur, *ut Græcæ vocis originem in barbaris ne quæramus.* p. 67. Here again he is totally mistaken ; as must be obvious to all, who have read me. I may sometimes shew a seeming analogy between different languages, subsisting at the same time : but my elements, whether true or false, are derived from a higher source : they are not sought for among any nations styled barbarous ; but taken from a primitive language, antecedent to Greece, and all its contemporaries.

I shall now proceed to his verbal criticisms : and here, I think, the whole dispute between us may be brought into small compass. The grammarians have laid down particular rules in treating of Grecian etymology : which this learned critic looks upon as infallible : and consequently to be invariably followed. I have an opinion of his learning : yet I cannot by any means accede to his notions. I look upon these rules to be arbitrary, uncertain, and oftentimes absolutely false. On this account he insists, that I am but partially informed : and *totally unacquainted with the genius of the Greek and Latin languages.* Be this, as it may : I will give my reasons for differing from him : and for that purpose will canvass some passages ; where for his own sake as well as mine he treats me with too much contempt. And yet I must confess, that I am in some respects worse than he makes me : for I must assure him, that I do not sin out of ignorance.

I know-

I knowingly and wilfully offend, if any offence there be.

I had taken notice of the word *καυμα*, heat; and mentioned it as a primitive word: and shewed that it was to be found in the Hebrew and Arabic languages: and that it was the same as Cham, and Chama, (חם .חמ) which have the like signification. Upon this my opponent makes this remark concerning me. *Pervulgatissima grammaticorum præcepta aut nescivisse, aut neglexisse videtur. Καυμα a voce Cham repetendo, non de verbo καιω, καυω, cogitavit; neque de terminatione frequentissimâ μα. Itaque mire infensus est Græcorum terminationibus, quæ cum sæpe male habuerunt. p. 68.* I must confess, that if I had been asked, when a boy, whence *καυμα* was derived, I should have answered from *κεκαυμαι*. And *καυσις* I should have deduced from *κεκαυσαι*; and *καυτης* from *κεκαυται*: and I should have given a well-known rule;—that almost all verbals are derived either from the first person of the præterperfect passive in *μα*; or from the second person, if they end in *ις*; or from the third person, if in *της*. If the genius of the Greek language consists in such slight notices; I was acquainted with it when almost a child. But who can think, that there is any validity in this mode of derivation? Can any body in their senses suppose, that a word signifying heat can be derived from *I have been made hot*: and that the cause was deduced from the effect. *Καυμα* is an external inflammatory principle; and betokens solar influence, and elementary heat and burning. This will appear from the general usage of the term.

Ὅτι δ' ἐκ νεφελῶν σπερμνὴ φαίνεται αἰὲρ
καυματος ἐξ ἀνεμοῖο δυνάεος ορνυμένοιο.

Iliad. ε. v. 864.

Καυμα

καὶ μὲν δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων κατέχεν ἰαεῖδες πρῶτον.

Hesiod. Theog. v. 844.

It is very proper for grammarians to bring words of the same relation and genus under a proper arrangement; and to place them under one head for the sake of method and memory. But this way of proceeding, though necessary, is not always founded in truth: and the subordination is often imaginary. It is very proper to divide an army into various parts; and to place a person over every division. But the person so placed is so far from being the father of the whole, that he is oftentimes the youngest of the corps. We attribute both to the heavens and to the earth meridians and parallels; and circles of other denominations. These are undoubtedly necessary; and of great service: but who ever thought, that they really existed? The canons, to which grammarians would confine etymology, are in many instances as ideal as the lines in a sphere. A person must not be looked upon as a novice or an idiot, if he doubts of their reality. As my ingenious opponent is so devoted to these rules, I would fain ask him, which he thinks prior; nouns, or verbs: and by what criterion he determines. I believe, it would prove a puzzling question. I would also desire to know, whether he thinks, that a set of men framed language: and that they agreed, such terms should be principal; and such derivative and dependant: and accordingly formed the canons of grammar. They must at this rate have been in possession of the very thing, they sought after: which shews the absurdity of the supposition. Language is certainly artificial; however it may have varied. It witnesses wonderful design in its correspondent parts, and arrangement. Nor can we
be

be surprized at this, when we may be certain, that the artificer was God. It may at first appear too presumptuous to determine about the designs of the Deity : and the method, which he was pleased to observe in his operations. But as God delights to shew himself in his works ; and to have his wisdom manifested by its effects ; we may venture to make inquiry. Above all, as we know, how man is gifted, and at the same time, that he is limited in his faculties ; we may from hence form a judgment of the process, by which he was led on towards the expressing of his ideas. As the Deity never displays any unnecessary instance of his power, we may presume, that language came by degrees. We may farther reason from man's powers being circumscribed, that knowledge was afforded him in proportion, as he was capable of receiving it. Those objects, which were more obvious, and necessary, were undoubtedly most likely to be distinguished. These were *things* : such as the luminaries in the heavens ; and upon earth hill and dale, wood and meadow, fountain and stream, food, and raiment. But above all we may suppose, that among the various objects in the creation, animals stood among the foremost to be named. And we accordingly find it mentioned by Moses, that, when God had formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, *he brought them to Adam to see, what he would call them : and whatever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave name to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air ; and to every beast of the field.* Gen. c. ii. v. 19. 20. By degrees he must have learned to express his particular feelings. Hence heat and cold, hunger and thirst, pleasure and pain, received their denomination. As his ideas increased, language improved : especially
I
when

when he had gotten a confort; and when a progeny ensued. He also shewed in what manner and at what time he had any experience, and also described not only, what he suffered, in a passive state; but also how he acted himself; and how others acted, to whose operations he was witness. We may suppose, that he at last began to abstract, and to compare; and to form combinations: from whence a new set of words must have been invented to express the several ideas. In all this, I imagine, that he was progressively led on by divine wisdom, in proportion, as he had abilities to learn. And of this, I think, we may be sure, that *things* were first named. And by things I mean the works of nature: and those impressions, and affections, to which the nature of man is most immediately liable. For there are also things, which are either the work of art; or the consequence of later and deeper consideration. Between these, and the former, there is a material difference. For the former stand first, and are manifestly principal and independant; the latter are subsequent, dependant, and derivative; being denominated from the means or method by which they were produced. For they are effects, and denominated from their cause. Suppose, that I were to insist, that not only nouns were in great measure first framed; but that passive verbs were in order next: and the active last. I do not say, that it certainly was so: but such a position would not easily be confuted. All verbs deduced from simple ideas are properly passive; however differently adjudged by grammarians. I feel, I smell, I taste, in their nature denote passion; as much, as I am burnt or I am heated. In short in respect to doing and suffering, may we not suppose man to have been acted upon, before he himself acted: and that he expressed his own affections,

affections, before he was himself an agent, and witness to the feelings of others. But be this as it may : what I principally insist upon in respect to ancient etymology is, that the cause must precede the effect ; and cannot be deduced from it : for the cause was first known and named. *Καυμα* cannot be derived from *καιω* or *καυω*. It is a primitive and original term : the very same as, *חמה* of the Hebrews ; by which is signified both the *sun* and *heat*. Rules may be laid down, and canons formed : but whoever would be conducted with security, must proceed upon principles, which were prior to grammar and grammarian : by an analogy, which is deduced from truth and nature ; to which their rules are often repugnant.

I am accused in the same manner about the word *ἥλιος* ; and am greatly blamed for not knowing that the last syllable was merely a Grecian termination. And indeed I did not know it : nor do I now believe it : to say the truth, I am convinced of the contrary. We may be greatly mistaken, if we think, that every word, thus terminated, is lengthened by a Grecian appendage. There are many names from other countries, a circumstance perhaps not much attended to ; which end in the same manner. We read of *רִיוֹשׁ. אַחַשְׁוֶרֶשׁ. בֶּרֶשׁ*. Cyrus, Ahasuerus, Darius ; whose names have the like termination in Hebrew : and we may be pretty sure, that they had the same in the Persic. The word *χωλος*, debilitatus, mutilatus, is probably the same as *חלש* in a prior language. As to the word *ἥλιος*, I make no doubt but that it was originally in the ancient Pelasgic expressed *ηλιον*. But the Grecians continually changed *ν* into *ς* ; and out of, *קֶרֶן* *keren*, they formed *κερας* ; out of *Μανεθων*, *Μανεθως* : of which changes I have given many instances. *ἥλιος* was a word introduced from the East

East by the first colonies, who came into Greece: and how it was originally rendered, we may learn from Sanchoniathon: who expresses it *Ελιουν*, *Elioun*. He is mentioning some of the first personages upon earth, to whom were given divine titles: and he speaks of them in the following manner. *Κατα τούτους γινεται τις Ελιουν, καλουμενος Ὑψιστος, και Σηλεια λεγομενη Βηρουθ, εξ ὧν γεννηται Επιγειος, η Αυτοχθων, ον ὑπερον εκαλεσαν Ουρανον.* Euseb. Præp. Evang. L. i. p. 36. We find, that one of these persons was Beryth; another was called Uranus, or Heaven: and a third stiled *Elioun, the Sun*: who was also named *Ὑψιστος, the most High*. It may be farther known from the compound *Abelion, Αβελιων*; under which title the Sun is known to have been worshiped. Hence we have inscriptions, *DEO ABELLIONI*; and *ABELLIONI DEO TAURINUS*. Gruter. Vol. I. p. xxxvii. The name of Apollo, *Απολλων*, is supposed by Vossius to be a derivative from *Abellion*: which is a compound of *Ab* and *Elion*. Troy was sacred to the Sun, the same as Apollo: and it was from hence stiled *Ilion*: which is only a variation of the former term. Some of the Grecian poets altered it to *Ιλιος*, and made it a feminine; and so it occurs in Homer. But among prose writers it occurs a neuter: and it is so found in Strabo. Stephanus also informs us, *ἡδετερως δε παρει πασι το Ιλιον*. And that it was very properly so rendered, we may be farther assured by the Romans, who always express it *Ilion*, or *Ilium*: and they were said to be a Phrygian colony: and to have come from this very place. Hence we find it thus introduced by Horace:

————— *Ilion, Ilion,*
Fatalis incestusque Judex,
Et Mulier peregrina vertit
In pulverem.

Another

Another poet, prior to Horace, speaks of it in some very fine verses by the name of Ilium: in which verses he has a distant allusion to the original of the Romans from Troy.

O! Patria, O! Divôm domus, Ilium, et inclyta bello

Pergama —————

Quæ neque Dardaneis campis potuere perire;

Quæ non capta capi; quæ non combusta cremari.

The terms Ilion, Elion, and Ilium, are nothing more than the Elioun of Sanchoniathon: the same word ending indifferently with ν or μ , accordingly as nations varied in their mode of termination. From hence, I think, we may be certain, that ω in this instance was not an appendage; but a part of the original word Ηλιων , or Ηλιων ; only varied by the Greeks.

A like censure has been passed upon me for what I have mentioned about Nimrod, and Mount Nebrodes (Νεβρωδης) in Sicily. Here again I am supposed to have been not apprised, that the latter part ($\omegaδης$) was a Grecian termination. I must reply, as I have done before, that I really did not know it: nor do I know it now: for it certainly cannot be esteemed so. A part only of the last syllable is the termination: Nebrod, Νεβρωδ , is the original word. As there are many passages relating to the same history, for which I am called to account, I will bring them together, and lay them before the reader in the words of the author. Jam in rebus ipsis non minor est vel negligentia, vel conjectandi temeritas. Quid est, quod p. 9. Græcos Nimrodum, Νεβρωδ , nominâsse ex Chronico Paschali demonstrare conatur; cujus in hac re nulla potest esse auctoritas; nam qui Nimrodum

memorant

memorant Græci, fuere posterioris ætatis, nec aliunde eum, quam ex libris N. T. cognitum habuerunt. p. 10. Christianorum plerique non aliunde rerum orientalium cognitionem hauserunt, quam ex libris Veteris Testamenti. p. 70. In Plinio pro Venereâ corrigit Venaria: quæ primum inaudita est vox Romanis: deinde refutatur nummo Claudii, quem ex Ligoris memorat Cellarius Geogr. T. 1. p. 60. Ibidem cum contenderet Nimrodum et Bacchum eundem esse, attulit in ejus opinionis argumentum locos Silii et aliorum. Igitur, quia nebride cincti erant Bacchi cultores, *Nimbrod* idem erit, ac Bacchus? p. 11. Quia Athenis, et Co insulâ, gens erat Nebridæ, nullum potuit habere quam Nimrodum auctorem? p. 76. 77. He had before, p. 61: given in a little more than twenty lines a like epitome of my sentiments upon this occasion: including within that interval an irregular and confused account of an history; which in the original is diffused over some hundreds of pages. He applies to one passage only without the least regard to whatever may be said elsewhere; introducing my opinions in the most unfair manner, and divesting them of every argument, by which they were supported. The best regulator, that ever was framed, must be rendered useless, and ruined, if abridged of its weights, and robbed of its principal movements. In respect to his first position, there are four things, of which we must take notice. First, he says, I try to prove, that Nimrod was called Νεβρωδ by the Greeks from the Chronicon Paschale: as if I had quoted that author only; and as if there were not still others, besides those, to whom I apply; who might be quoted to the same purpose. In the next place he intimates that the persons, who stile him Nebrod, were merely Christian writers: Thirdly, That

That they were of late date, and that all the knowledge, which they had of Eastern history, was from the Old Testament. In answer to this, it is to be observed, that the name Nebrod is to be found, not only in the Chronicon Paschale; but in Epiphanius, Suidas, Johannes Antiochenus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Eusebius, with the history of the person subjoined. But it will be said, that *their evidence was too late*; as if all improvements in history were to be estimated merely by the time, in which they are introduced. But the name is mentioned by writers still prior: particularly by Theophilus of Antioch; who expresses it Νεβρωθ. L. 2. p. 370. Is this sufficiently early? In short Nimrod is called Nebrod by Josephus, and Philo: who were not Christians; nor of later ages: there can be no exception to their evidence. The latter speaks of the tower, and its being built by Nimrod: ἀρχαντος τῶν ἐργων Νεβρωθ. Ἑρμηνεύεται Νεβρωθ αὐτομολησις. De Gigant. v. I. p. 272. Lastly, It is mentioned by the translators of the Septuagint: whoever they may have been. Χρὲς δὲ ἐγεννήθησεν τὸν Νεβρωθ: Gen. c. x. v. 8. These were neither Christians; nor of late date: but above two centuries before the Christian æra. Nor could they have borrowed it from the Bible: for there it is differently rendered. Indeed this variation in the name was effected out of complaisance to the Grecian idiom, and in conformity to the historians of that nation. But this writer will tell me, that the Greek fathers knew of no such historians: all that they had heard of this history was from the Old Testament: nec aliunde quam ex libris veteris Testamenti hauserunt. This is very strange: for it is notorious, that they quote numberless authors to this purpose: and mention others, in whom this history must have necessarily been included: so

that it is injurious to limit their knowledge to the Scriptures only. Clemens of Alexandria quotes Berosus, and Alexander Polyhistor, together with other authors, who treated of the Babylonish history; and of the first events in that nation. He appeals to Eupolemus: also to Euphorus; whom he quotes about the confusion of tongues, and speaks of other writers upon that head. *Ευφορος, και αλλοι πολλοι των Ισθρικων.* Strom. L. I. p. 404. This was a circumstance, which could not be introduced by historians without some account of Nimrod; and of the events, which preceded. At all rates the knowledge of Clemens must not be limited to the Bible. Almost every page in this valuable father proves the contrary. In like manner Theophilus and Tatianus shew, that they were well versed in ancient history; as they refer to various authors, such as Theodotus, Mochus, Hypsicrates, Lætus, and Menander Pergamenus: to whom many others might be added. These were either Eastern writers; or treated of oriental history. But above all it may be seen in Eusebius; for he applies to variety of historians, who had treated of the most early times; and of the Chaldaic history in particular. Such were Berosus, Abydenus and Apollodorus. Such also Molus, Melo, Mochus, Hellanicus, Cephalion, Mnaseas, Thallius, Arcefilaus, Hieronymus Ægyptius, Metrodorus Lampfacenus, Hestæus, Nicolaus Damascenus, Ostanes, Philo Byblius, Sanchoniathon, Castor, Philochorus, Apion, Polemo, Megasthenes, who lived with Seleucus Nicator; and the Babylonian Bardesanes. He quotes from Abydenus an account of Babel, and the tower: also of its being overthrown by whirlwinds: and of the confusion of speech, which ensued. The same is mentioned from Hestæus, together with the

the dispersion of the rebellious crew ; and of the Titan war. This history was more fully related by Eupolemus, whom Eusebius quotes at large. Many other of the fathers draw from the like sources : and as their works are extant, how can it with the least shew of truth be said, that they knew nothing of oriental history, nor of Nimrod, but what they obtained from the Scriptures ? Does not the history of Babylon, and the tower ; of the confusion of speech, and the dispersion, relate to him ? To whom then do they relate ? And if Clemens, and Eusebius, knew nothing but the Scriptures, how came they to leave behind them such a treasure of knowledge ? If things really are, as I have represented them, why does this writer say of me with such confidence — *perperam eandem fidem ac laudem tribuit Christianis, ac exteris : nam Christianorum plerique non aliunde rerum orientalium cognitionem hauserunt, quam ex libris Veteris Testamenti*, p. 70. Had I not given the proofs already afforded ; yet who could possibly imagine but that Tatianus Assyrius, Theophilus of Antioch, Clemens of Alexandria, Ephraim of Syria, Theodoret of the same region, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Origen of the same, Eusebius of Cæsarea, must have known more of their own countries, than the people of Elis or Attica. Add to these the writers of the western church ; such as Tertullian, Jerome, and Lactantius ; with others of great knowledge, obtained from every part of the world. All those, who were Grecians, this annotator takes collectively ; and says, that in general they knew nothing of eastern history, excepting what they got from their Bible. He seems to proceed upon this principle, that the nearer we are to an object, the less we are acquainted with it.

In respect to Nimrod I have shewn, that his history is of the greatest consequence in the annals of the world, as well as of the primitive church. He was the first rebel and apostate upon earth; and formed a desperate confederacy: in consequence of which he made war upon his brethren. *ὅπλα κατα των φίλων ηρατο Νεβρωδ.* Philo. Vol. 1. p. 272. He built Babel, after he had ejected Assur from his principality; and tried to maintain himself upon forbidden ground. But the tower was ruined, and his associates were dissipated over the face of the earth. Their flight was attended with a confusion of speech, and wonderful dismay; which does not seem to have left them, till they had got to their destined habitation. Nimrod was the son of Chus; and according to Bochart was by his people stiled Bar-Chus; which in the Chaldaic signifies the son of that person. From hence he with much reason thinks, that the name of Bacchus took its rise: which like that of Dionusus was not always uniformly conferred. The disunion of this formidable body, which he had collected, was represented hieroglyphically, as the tearing of his body to pieces, and the scattering of his limbs different ways. And those of the confederacy, which were dispersed, had in after-times the name of Meropes given them from their speech being divided. He was the first king of Babylon; and indeed the first of the whole earth: and this first king is by Berofus called Alorus; and Alorus the shepherd. He was also called Orion; *Νεβρωδ, ὁ και Ενηχοος και Ωριων.* Cedrenus, p. 14. and under this character he was represented as a gigantic person, and a great hunter. Bochart has many arguments, to prove that Nimrod and Orion were the same. Indeed there can be no doubt of it. The princes of Babylon assumed divine titles: and it is remarkable,

markable, that where the prophet Isaiah is mentioning the ruin of the Babylonians, he alludes to their monarch and princes under the titles of the heavenly bodies. And where it is said in the original, *The stars of heaven and their casil* (כסיל) *shall fall*; by which is meant the nobles and their king; it is rendered in the Seventy — *οἱ ἀστέρες τῆς Οὐρανῶς καὶ Ὠρίων. The stars of Heaven and Orion.* Isaiah c. xiii. v. 10. From hence we may infer, that it was an hereditary title, derived from the first monarch to others. The fawn was made an emblem of Nimrod, and of the dispersion, and it was called νεῦρος; which I make no doubt in the ancient Pelasgic was νεῦροδ. It was probably thus applied as a symbol; because it is the most fugitive of all animals, and the most easily dismayed. On this account it was looked upon as a proper type for the people of the dispersion. Homer stiles persons in a panic—*τῆθ' ἡπότες ἥτε νεῦροι.* Il. δ. v. 243. The Bacchæ used to cut a fawn to pieces, and scatter its limbs abroad. Sometimes at their frantic rites they made use of a young steer for that purpose, which they used to rend to pieces alive. Hence Catullus speaking of these rites among other things mentions—

Horum pars tectâ quatiebant cuspide thyrsos :

Pars e divulso jactabant membra juvenco.

Peleus & Thet. v. 256.

They also used to clothe themselves at this season with the spotted skin of the fawn called νεῦρος; from whence they are thought by some to have had the name of Nebridæ. It was probably used in this manner as an emblem of that constellation, which they had appropriated to Nimrod, and called Orion. For this asterism abounds with stars; of which the spots in the skin might be

esteemed a proper type. And the author of the Orphic verses certainly alludes to this, when he mentions Bacchus putting on—*Δερμα πολυσικτε θηρος*—*Ἀσρων δαιδαλεων μιμημ', ἱερὸν τε πολοιο*. Fragment. 7. Hence Bacchus had the title of *νεβροχιτων* and *νεβριδοσολος*; and is mentioned with these very remarkable titles—

Νυκτελιον, Νομιον, Νεβρωδεα, Νεβροδοπεπλον.

Πελυποτον, πλαγτηρα, πολυσεφανον, πολυκωμον.

Antholog. L. i. p. 50. Steph.

In consequence of these histories, and many others too tedious to be recapitulated, I thought that I saw plainly some traces of this extraordinary person in Sicily: and that there was particularly a mountain, abounding with beasts for the chase, which was called Nebrodes from him. The annotator upon this has accused me of gross ignorance in not knowing, that the latter part of the word (*ωδης*) was a termination; and *that the mountain was named from νεβρος, a fawn*. This is a strange object for such a place to be denominated from: and I know not how to conceive it. I have heard of Sierra Leona, deserts of lions; but never of whelps: of wealds of bears; but never of cubs: of woods of boars; but not of pigs. How came the mountain to be named from the young fry only? If there were no aged animals, from whence were these produced? But after all, how does the author know, that this was a Grecian word? The names of hills, and promontories; of woods and rivers, are of long duration; and those who succeed to places, commonly acquiesce in the names already imposed. The Grecians were comparatively late in their getting footing in Sicily. We learn from Thucydides L. 5. that there had been Læstrygonians, Cyclopians, Sicani, Opici, and other nations

tions of great antiquity before them. The Grecians were posterior even to the Pœni. Why then does he take for granted, that Nebrodes was a Grecian word: and given as a name by people of that country. As we find in Sicily, and not far from this place, the names Elorus, and Pelorus; titles of Nimrod; and an history of Orion, the son of Urius; which signifies merely a native of Ur and Babylonia; why may we not suppose, that the mountain was denominated in memory of this person? No, says my opponent: he was not called Nebrod but by writers of late date; Christian writers, in whom there is no trust. But Josephus was not a Christian, nor a late writer: and he calls him not merely Nebrod, but Νεβρωδης, *Nebrodes*; the very name in dispute: Νεβρωδης—ὕιωνος τῆς Χαμ, τῆς Νωε, *Nebrodes, the grandson of Cham, the son of Noah*. Ant. L. 1. C. 4. p. 19. He was a gigantic person, a great hunter; the same as Orion Urius: and the mountain was undoubtedly denominated from him. His true name was eclipsed by that more general one of Bacchus; yet it was sometimes alluded to by the Grecians, as we find by the verse before quoted, which contains some of the titles of that person.

Νυκτελιον, Νομιον, ΝΕΒΡΩΔΕΑ, Νεβροδοπεπλον.

A mistake in etymology is comparatively trifling: but an error in reasoning, and in history, is of great consequence. And misconception, when it arises from spleen and prejudice; and when attended with unnecessary severity, deserves no quarter.

I have supposed, that the island Nebrissa near Gades had by its name a reference to the same person: especially as it was devoted to the rites and worship of Bacchus. And as it is mentioned by Pliny under the name *Veneria*; I have surmised, that this might have been a mistake for *Venaria*.

My words are, *I should think a mistake*: by which I did not mean merely a mistake in the writer; but a difference arising from length of time; and from the ignorance of the colonists in so remote a part of the world. For this I am called to account. In Plinio pro 'Venereâ corrigit Venaria: quæ primum inaudita est vox Romanis. p. 77. Yet this same Pliny, speaking of the Fortunate Islands takes notice of Canaria; which he says, was so named from dogs, L. 1. p. 349. and Pliny was a Roman, and of great learning. If canis caninus can give Canaria; why may not venor venari produce Venaria? I do not think, that the derivation from canis is right: yet who would call Pliny either knave or fool? It shews plainly, that he did not think this kind of derivation such an unpardonable solæcism. Still it is urged, that Venaria is a name never heard of by the Romans. But my opponent hurries on too fast: for this very Pliny mentions an island so called upon the coast of Italy, even in the confines of Latium; and not a vast way from the Tiber.—Barpana, Mænaria, Columbaria, Venaria. L. 3. p. 160. My notion is said to be farther contradicted by a coin of Claudius. But this has little weight: for if there had been antecedently a variation in the name; those, who came after, would abide by the change. But let the name be, what it will, what does the whole amount to? My opinion I introduced as a doubt; and never dreamt, that a mere supposition would be misconstrued for a fixed principle, and be so shamefully misrepresented,

¹ It is not Venerea in Pliny. It is in that author found with the penultima otherwise expressed—Veneria. This the annotator alters without any notice: and without any authority. But he does it to make my change the more glaring and heinous.

My adversary proceeds upon the same subject, and arraigns me for my judgment about the people stiled Nebridæ, particularly those at the island Coüs, or Cos : Quia Athenis et in Co insula gens erat Nebridæ, nullum potuit alium habere quam Nimrodum auctorem. p. 77. This is very laconic; and equally decisive. Now it must be observed, that in speaking of this people I have taken notice, that they were stiled Meropes; and their island was called Meropeis: and that people so called were denominated from their language having been of old divided and confounded. ΜΕΡΟΠΕΣ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΚΕΚΛΗΝΤΑΙ ΔΙΑ ΜΕΜΕΡΙΣΜΕΝΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΦΩΝΗΝ. Epiphanius, L. I. p. 7. Hesychius describes them much in the same manner: ΔΙΑ ΜΕΜΕΡΙΣΜΕΝΗΝ ΕΧΕΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΟΡΑ. They are also said to have had the name of Meropes from one Merops of the giant brood, ΑΠΟ ΜΕΡΟΠΟΣ ΥΠΟΓΕΝΕΣ. Steph. Byzant. They were likewise reported to have been descended from Eumelus, a shepherd, whose father was Merops; the head of the Meropians. Pindar takes notice of the Meropes, and of their monarch Alcuon; who was a gigantic person, and said to have been slain by Hercules. By Hercules was meant the chief Deity. *He destroyed the Meropians together with their king Al-Cuon, the shepherd; whom he found at Phlegra, and who was in size like a mountain.* Pindar Isth. 6. v. 45. Now Phlegra was not in the island Coüs: from whence we may perceive that the history was foreign, and imported. Al-Cuon signifies the king κατ' ἐξοχην: and Phlegra is only another word of the same signification for Ur in Babylonia, the land of *fire*. Here these events really happened; though transferred to other parts. From these and other evidence I supposed, that the families stiled Nebridæ were descended from people of the dispersion; and that their island was occupied,

occupied, and named by persons of that race. We accordingly find from Eusebius, that among the islands possessed by the sons of Ham westward, Cos or Coüs was one. *Θασον, Σαμον, Κνιδον, Κων.* Chron. p. 12. The same is mentioned by Syncellus. This, and much more, I said upon the occasion: the whole of which is totally neglected by my opponent. The brief, or no, account given by him I have laid before the reader. It is there seen how naked and defenceless my opinion is held forth to the world; stript of every thing, that could be said in its favour. Euclid went upon demonstration: but could Euclid stand the test, if mutilated in this manner, and exposed to so unfair a trial?

I took notice of the word *οχα*, which in Homer uniformly comes before *αριστος*; and never precedes any other word.

Καλχας Θεσπιδης οiwνοπολων οχ' αριστος.

I thought, that I could perceive it in some ancient names of different people, both single and compounded: as in Achor, Achorus, Uchoreus, Uccousos, Belochus, Ochus. From hence I conjectured, that it related to something great and excellent. This is not allowed by my opponent: for he says, that the whole is an idle surmise: and the word is of Grecian origin, and derived from *οχος* firmus. Thus *οiwνοπολων οχ' αριστος* means augurum firmiter excellentissimus: *Φωκαιων οχ' αριστος*, Phocensium firmiter præstantissimus: *Αιτωλων οχ' αριστος*, Ætolorum firmiter optimus. This surely is an odd construction. It is to be observed, that this term occurs no where but in this poet: if we except an instance or two, where it is manifestly copied. Is it not strange to take an ancient word scarcely found but in Homer, and to derive it from one more recent, never found in Homer.

Why did he not say, that it was derived from *οχος*, *dux*: as that would have been nearer the truth? They have undoubtedly a close analogy; and are of the same original. In short *οχα* is a primitive, and very uncommon word; and means adverbially, not firmly, but eminently. And *οχος*, the substantive, signifies Dux, Ductor, Princeps. By *οχ' αριστος* is meant a person far the most excellent in his profession. If the word were of Grecian original, how comes it even in Homer so seldom to be used: and, when it does occur, to be solely connected with the word *αριστος*. And how comes it likewise to be never found in any one writer of the least eminence afterwards: though both in Homer and in other writers, there were such fair opportunities for its being introduced? We never meet with *οχ' αρειων*, nor *οχ' αμεινων*; much less does it accompany any other noun or verb. Hence I take it to be an ancient and foreign term: and to have no relation to the verb *εχω*: nor to *εχοχος* and *εχοχα*; though they are supposed to be compounds from it. They denote choice and peculiarity: but the words *οχα*, and *οχος*, of which I treat, betoken eminence and dignity.

I took notice, that the words *Aith*, and *Ait*, signified heat; and had a relation to fire. That Egypt, the land of Ham, was called *Aëtia*: and from the name of the king *Æetes*, we may infer, that Colchis, which was peopled by a colony from Egypt, had the same name. Moreover when the Queen *Arete* was for sending *Medea* back to her own country, she expresses it *ες ηθεα Κολχων*; making use of a periphrasis; and of a term, which was of the same analogy as the names above. Such was the purport of my words. Upon this the Annotator delivers himself in the following manner. *Quid quod p. 20. ubi Æetes, Cholchici Regis nomen,*

nomen, ab *Ait*, quod ut ipse ait, ignis est, repetitur, aure et sono deceptus in versu Orphico (Argon. v. 1323) *ἡθεα Κολχων* ab eadem origine dici statuit: cum *ἡθεα* centies apud scriptores, *consuetas sedes, domicilium*, denotent? Cum ubique in Bryantio temeritatis novitatem miraremur, excogitare tamen non potuimus, qui eum stupor tenuerit; cum hæc scriberet; nos quidem cum legeremus, oculis nostris vix fidem habuimus. Ex eodem errore est, quod de *ἡθειος* dicitur. p. 68. Notwithstanding what is here said, the same fatality attends me: and I am still under the same cloud. Indeed I do not see clearly upon what this investive is founded. That *ἡθεα* signifies an house, or habitation, is well known: but how does that hinder its being derived from *aith*, fire. Why, by his not rendering it simply an habitation, but terming it *consuetas sedes*, he would insinuate, that it was derived from *ἔθος*, mos. But to this I cannot subscribe; though I am sensible, that it has the sanction of several learned men. My opinion is, that not only proper names of regions and cities, such as *Æthea*, *Æthle*, *Ætherea*, *Æthale*, *Æthalia*, *Ætine*, *Æthusa*, *Aetia*, *Æthiopia*, were named from fire; but that the common names of places were often denominated from the same element under different terms. For as of old the rites of fire prevailed almost universally, most places of resort had their names either from the public, and sacred fires; or from the private and domestic hearths: so that both the greater and smaller communities were distinguished from the same object. Thus *ἄστ*, *ἄστος*, *ἑστία*, the same as *Vesta*, are all from *Ast*, fire.

Nec tu per Vestam nisi vivam intellige flammam.
Ovid.

Hence

Hence *ἑστια* signified *βωμος η οικια*. Hesych : either *an altar, or an house* : for every house had an altar, and was accordingly denominated Hestia from the sacred fire. Accordingly the same writer tells us, *ἑστια πυρ*. In like manner *κωμη, κωμοπολις, πυργος, πυργηδον, αιθυσσα, πυραθειον*, relate to public or private fires ; by which both people and families were distinguished. The words *χωρα, χωριον*, and Curia, related originally to the same element. And it is remarkable, that Ur of Chaldea, denominated from fire, is by the Seventy called *Χωρα*. Among these were *Ηθος* and *Ηθεα* ; which like *ἑστια*, related to fire hearths : and were derived from *aith*, fire. From hence came *ηθος*, indoles, ingenium ; and *εθος*, consuetudo. And on account of the ambiguity, which must necessarily ensue, from the same word having two senses, the primitive *ηθος*, focus, domicilium, in great measure lost its singular : and was generally expressed *ηθεα*, and uncontracted. Hence came *Ηθειος* ; which though it is said to be a name of respect ; and so occurs ; yet it certainly was at first a title of endearment, and relation. For *Ηθειος* meant one of the family ; one of the same fire side. *Ηθειος, αδελφος, συγγενης, φιλος*. Hesych. I am sensible, that some of the Lexicographers, and Scholiasts differ from me : for by interpreting *ηθεα, συνηθεις τοπες*, they intimate, that the word was derived from *εθος*, consuetudo. But this is contrary to nature. By *ηθεα* were confessedly signified places of habitation, in which societies were formed, and families constituted. Is society to be deduced from custom ; or custom and manners from society ? According to the order of things the dwelling must be first : then the people stiled *Ηθαιοι, αδελφοι, συγγενεις, φιλοι*, and from them proceed *ηθη*, mores : which are always relative and subsequent to the society, from whence they proceed.

ceed. People imagining that *ηθεα* came from *εθος*, consuetudo, have rendered it *της συνηθεις τοπας* : but it signified simply a place, whither people resorted and lived. *Ηθος* in the singular betokened properly focus familiaris : and *Ηθειος* was a partaker of that common hearth ; and by it was denoted a brother, relation and friend. From hence came customs, social manners, and social virtues : which were not primary, but derivative.

Were it otherwise, yet why should I be blamed about the etymology of a word ; when the Grecians themselves were at variance. Chamælion was an ancient commentator upon Homer : and we are told by Eustathius, that his opinion was controverted : and the dispute was about this very word. *Χαμαιλεοντος*—*μεμφονται οι παλαιοι*. See Eustathii ad Iliad. l. c. p. 1290. 25. And that we may not suppose merely that one writer disagrees with another, it is worth while to observe the difference, which subsists in the same person, Hesychius, about this very word *ηθειος* : He mentions it in the vocative as a term of reverence : *Ηθειε, ω θειε, ω θαυμασιε*. On which account it is derived from *α* intensive, and *θειος*, *divinus*. This was the opinion also of the critic before mentioned, the same for which he was censured. Hesychius speaks of it again in the nominative ; where among other things it signifies *αδελφος, συγγενης, φιλος* ; titles, which relate not in the least to reverence ; but to familiarity and acquaintance. Here the etymologists suppose it to be deduced from *εθος, mos, consuetudo*. Lastly it is mentioned by the same author in the feminine, and made synonymous to *ωραια*. *Ηθειη, ωραια*. Here it has no relation either to reverence, or to acquaintance : but to time and maturity : for it is a term metaphorically taken from fruit, which

is ripened by heat, and it is derived from αἶθω. Eustathius says that Ἡθεός, juvenis, is the same as ὤραιος: and the author of the Etymologicum informs us, that Ἡθεός is derived from, αἶθω, uro, quasi αἶθεός. According to this analogy Ηθείος, ὤραιος, must be derived from the same: at least from the word Aith, heat; from whence αἶθω it self came. This indeed is the true radix. In short αἶνυ, αἶνειος; ἔστια, ἔστιαιος; ἦθος, ἦθειος; ὤρα, ὤραιος; are of the same analogy, and relate to the same element, being all equally derived from its synonymous terms, Ait, Esta, Aith, and Ur.

He says, that Naïs, a water deity, is from ναῶν and ναίω, fluo. Suppose, that I were to turn the tables, and derive ναῶν from ναῖς: I do not see how he could prove the contrary. The truth is, that they are both derived from a prior word, *ain*, a fountain, and I make no doubt, but that ναῶν was originally expressed *αναῶν*; and Naïs, Anaïs: also Anaïd, Anaït, Anaïtis. After this manner, at different times was the ancient nominative rendered. For this my opinion I have two reasons. In the first place the oblique cases shew, that there has been a difference in termination. The genitive Naïdis, and dative Naïdi, must come from a nominative Naïd, or Naït. In the next place we find, that in Armenia, Assyria, and other eastern countries, from whence the Grecian mythology came, there was a goddess Anaït, and Anaïtis, who presided over hot fountains: and her temple was always near them. See Strabo. L. 11. p. 779. p. 865. L. 12. p. 838. L. 15. p. 1060. L. 16. p. 1072. In respect to the word ναῶν, it occurs once or twice in Homer in the same manner, as in other writers. But there is one passage, in which I think, we may trace the original word. It is where the poet is speaking of Ithaca, and the grotto of the Nymphs.

Εν δ' ὕδατ' αὐναοντα, δῶν δὲ τὲ οἱ θυραὶ εἰσὶν.
Odyss. N. v. 109.

I imagine, that ὕδατα αὐναοντα mean fountain waters from the original word αὐνω, *to flow like a fountain*. The authors of the Scholia suppose it to be a compound of αἰ νω, quasi αἰ ναόντα: but this is impossible: for the word αἰ often occurs in this poet, and the first syllable is always in respect to quantity short. For this reason, when there is occasion for its being used long, it is changed to αἰει. There is such a word as αἰναος, and also αἰρναος: but their quantity does not in any one syllable agree with that in Homer: and they are in other respects differently expressed. They are therefore different words. Theocritus says of the Argonautæ,

Ἐυρον αἰρναον κραναν ὑπο λισσαδι πετρῇ.
Idyl. 22. v. 37.

But both this word, as well as αἰναος, will be found to vary from that in Homer; and to be differently made up. The first, αὐναοντα from αἰν is simple, and signifies something flowing, and belonging to a fountain: The other two compounded of αἰει, relate to what is permanent, and lasting. They may be indeed joined to streams and waters, and to any thing else, that is of long continuation. Moses says, *The Eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms*: the latter part of which is rendered by the Seventy, καὶ ὑπο ισχυρῶν βραχιονῶν αἰρναων. Deuteron. C. 33. v. 27. In like manner we find in Job: Αἰρναος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐκλυεῖν με μέλων. *The person, who will free, or redeem, me, is everlasting*. Job. c. 19. v. 25. Herodotus mentions a lake, and styles it λιμνην αἰρναον. L. i. p. 48. This cannot properly relate to the flowing of a fountain,

as

as the word in Homer does: for lakes are stagnant, and their waters do not flow: though they may last, and do last, from time immemorial. In short *αενάω* of Homer is the simple and original word, which was contracted to *ναω*: and *αενναος* and *αενναος* are indeed compounds from the same; but are introduced in an improved sense, and used with a greater latitude. *Αενάω* is barely *to flow*: *αεινάω* and *αεννάω* signify *to flow perpetually*; and still farther, *to be everduring*. *Αενναος*, *διαρκης αει*, *η αει θαλλων*. Hesychius. *Αειναε*, *αει ετης*, *η αει ρεουσης*. Idem.

He continues to be very severe about the article of terminations; concerning which he supposes me to be grossly ignorant. And he accuses me of great neglect in not observing, that in the adjectives Spartanus, Cumanus, Thebanus, and the like, the last syllable is a mere inflexion, and addition, given to the original word by the Romans: according to whose idiom it was usual to make gentile names terminate in *nus*. He therefore thinks me inexcusably in the wrong to deduce any names of this sort from *ain* a fountain, which I have presumed to do in one or two instances. In answer to this I must in the first place observe, that I cannot admit the syllables *nus* and *anus* in words of this sort to be Roman additions: for the real termination is only the latter part *us*; the former being part of the original gentile appellation. It was very common among people in the east to form the family name from the primitive by terminating it in *an*. Thus the land of the Cuthites in Scripture is stiled the land of Cush: and the people are called Cushan. This I have reason to think obtained among the Persians: and among all those who were denominated Ethiopians. The Pelasgi brought this mode of nomination westward into

D

Europe;

Europe ; where it was kept up by the Romans : but among the Greeks it was difused ; who followed a different analogy. Among the former Roma was the city : Roman, a person of that city : and with the termination Romanus. The Grecians, the names of whose places ended generally in *αι*, made the gentile name terminate in *αιος*. Hence we read of *Θηβαιος*, *Αμυκλαιος*, *Φεραιος*, *Αθηναιος*. But the Romans preserved the true patronymic : and people were denominated by them, Spartan, Theban, Alban ; and with the termination, Spartanus, Thebanus, Albanus. In some instances the gentile name, instead of *an*, was expressed, with a small variation, *en* : and the termination was then in *sis* : as is observable in Phocæensis, Atheniensis, Melitenfis : and it was otherwise varied. But though this may be the case in general, yet I cannot think, that all words, which terminate in this manner, are necessarily formed by the same analogy. And I have accordingly ventured to deviate in one or two instances : and to form a derivation from *ain*, a fountain. The names of many places have manifestly a reference to this object. We read of Anchiale, Ancurion, Ancuræ, all which seem to relate to it ; and to have it in their composition, The city Ancyra, *Αγκυρα*, in Asia Minor, is a compound of An-Cur, five fons Solis : and was denominated from its worship : or perhaps from some real fountains, which were sacred to that deity. The region, and city, of Cyrene, by the Dorians expressed *Κυραινα*, were of the same etymology, but with the terms reversed. Kur-ain signified literally *the fountain of the Sun* : and the reason of the place being so called may be known from its history. Cyrenaica, eadem Pentapolitana, regio illustratur Hammonis oraculo, et *Fonte Solis*. Plin. L. 5.

L. 5. p. 249. The people who first settled about the bay of Naples in Italy, called one of the places, where they took up their abode, Cumæ, or Cum-ai; which signifies the land of heat: and the soil is well known to be very hot, and inflammable. Near this place are some hot fountains: and those, who named the town Cum-ai, would necessarily call the fountains Cum-ain: by which their quality is denoted: for Cumain signifies literally a hot fountain. As this was the case I ventured to conjecture, that the Ager Cumanus might have been denominated in this instance, not from the people, Cumani; but from these hot springs. I took the same liberty about the Ager Pisanus; as it was famous for some particular fountains: the Aquæ calidæ Pisanæ of Pliny. L. 2. c. 103. There was a celebrated place of this name in Greece: and here likewise was a fountain of great note. Πισα, πολις και κρηνη. Stephanus Byzant. Now what is very remarkable, Eustathius speaking of this city says, that it was named from the fountain: απο κρηνης εχει Πισης το ονομα. in Dionys. v. 409. The region therefore must have likewise been denominated from the same. Strabo seems to concur in the latter circumstance, when he says, that some would not allow, that there ever was a city called Pisa: κρηνην δε μονην: but it was *only the fountain* that had this name. L. 8. p. 546. and it was from hence, that the region was denominated. If then the fountain Pisa gave name either to the city, or to the country, in the Peloponnesus, why may we not suppose the same of the fountain in Italy. But let my opinion be right, or wrong, what does it amount to, that there should be so much invective in consequence of it. What is very inexcusable, the author forms etymologies of his own, and obtrudes them upon the reader as mine: of this

several instances may be produced. He likewise would insinuate, that I am guilty of falsehood in supposing, that there were hot springs at Cumæ. Erant enim, *ut ait*, ibi calidi fontes. p. 69: that is, *as he says: if you will take his word*. By this an unwary reader may be led to think, that I have imposed upon him: whereas the waters of Cumæ, and Baiæ, were as celebrated as any in the world. See Livy. L. 41. c. 16. p. 736. also Lucretius L. 6. v. 747.

Qualis apud Cumas locus est, montemque
Vesuvum,
Oppleri calidis ubi fumant fontibus auctus.

They were called aquæ Cumanæ and Baianæ indifferently: as being in the vicinity of both places. Their history is too well known to want any farther evidence. Yet the Annotator still persists in intimating, that I have been guilty of an untruth: and as I have deceived the reader in one instance, that I shall proceed to impose upon him in others. —et Latini quidem, quot habent nomina gentilitia in anus, tot beabuntur calidis fontibus. The purport of which is plainly this, that *wherever the Romans have a gentile name in anus, I shall forge a new spring: and enrich their country with as many fountains, as there are names of that analogy*. The insinuation is so gross and illiberal, that I shall say nothing to it: but leave it to the reader to judge, as shall seem best.

I cannot take upon me to answer every cavil of my adversary: as I should be obliged at this rate to recapitulate the greater part of my work. Besides I do not always know, wherein the objection lies: as he only hints disgust, and thinks it not worth his while to come to an explanation. **How-
ever**

ever of some of the more remarkable objections I will proceed to take notice.

Another censure brought against me is for my supposing, that the word Aphetor (Αφητωρ) related to a place instead of a person: cum secundum certissimas linguæ rationes ab ἀφῆτις oriatur. p. 68. The case is this. I had imagined, that many personages in Homer were formed from rivers, hills, and other objects; and the same is supposed by Strabo: L. 12. p. 847. In consequence of this I mentioned, that by Mentor was probably signified a Mentorian; one, who belonged to Men-Tor; by which was signified a temple of Men or Menes. And in like manner the term Aphetor in Homer might also relate to a tower. Apha signifies *fire*: and by Apha-Tor was meant a fire-tower; and there was probably such a one at Delphi, where a perpetual light was kept up. And I further supposed it, not to be so properly an epithet of the Deity, as the name of a real building consecrated to him. This is the whole amount of my crime: now it is to be observed, that the poet was fond of antique terms: and has introduced into his poems many obsolete words, which are difficult of interpretation. This is evident from the authors of the Scholiâ; who often vary about the signification of these terms; and know not which way to determine. And yet they proceeded secundum certissimas linguæ rationes, as they imagined: which has been the cause of their being bewildered. For though there is an analogy in all languages: yet no such infallible rules exist: for, as I have before said, they are very precarious, and oftentimes not founded in truth. How uncertain the purport was of these ancient words cannot be better seen than in the instance before us: and at the same time we may perceive the fatal consequences of this

infallible rule of investigation. The word occurs in Homer Il. 9. v. 404. who mentions *ἄσος Αφητορος*—*Φοῖβος Απολλωνος*: where the word *αφητορος* is supposed somehow to relate to Apollo. I have given my opinion: let us see, if these learned men can produce any thing better. We find the following interpretation in the Scholia. *Αφητορος, Απολλωνος: ητοι ὁμοφητορος, ὁμοίως πᾶσι προφητευοντος, και μαυτευομενης, τῷτε πενητι, και τῷ πλουσιῳ. η τοξοτα, απο της των βελων αφεσεως.* We find from hence, that the learned commentator imagines Aphetor to be a title of Apollo, either as a *prophet*, or else as an *archer*. But I should be glad to know which. For if the rules of etymology are so infallible, why is there any uncertainty? Hesychius likewise mentions *αφητορος, προφητευοντος, η τα τοξοτα.* It relates to Apollo either as a *prophet* or an *archer*. But these are two objects widely different: I want to know, which is the truth, and by what it is to be determined. For if the Scholiast does not know, which is right; they may be both wrong: and it is impossible to admit an etymology, where we are not certified of the history, upon which it depends. And if after all the whole is conjecture; I do not see, why I may not offer my opinion, as well as another. No, says my learned friend, there is no occasion to beat about for the meaning: for we have certain rules to go by: and the word Aphetor is from *αφιημι* *emitto*, and betokens *sending forth*. At this rate, if we choose, that it should relate to prophecy; it signifies the sending forth of prophecies: if to archery, it means the sending forth of *arrows*: *απο της των βελων αφεσεως.* Schol. Consequently we find, that if the term had been connected with Jupiter; it would have signified the sending forth of *thunder and rain*: if it had related to Mars, it would have denoted the sending forth of *armies*:

if to Ceres, the sending forth of *corn*: if to Pomona, the sending forth of *apples* and *turnips*. In respect to Apollo, as names are designed to distinguish, how can we suppose, that he could be marked in Homer by a title so indeterminate and vague. And here we may see, the fallacy of this mode of investigation. The scholiasts and critics first determined the etymology of the words, which came before them; and then hunted about for a meaning. Whereas they should have considered the purport and history first; and that would have led them to the etymology. No, say they; it must come from *αφηνμι*, and *αφεσεως*, a *sending forth*, either of *oracles* or *arrows*. But why not of *light* and *day*: or of *verses* and *poetry*: or of *airs* and *musick*? One word for all: The whole is a fallacy: and the method of inquiry preposterous.

My opinion was, that the term related to a place; and denoted a tower: let us now consider the account given by the Poet. He is speaking of Achilles, whom the Grecian chiefs are trying to bring over by rich presents, that he might save the army. He refuses, and tells them, that no offers can tempt him: not all the wealth of Troy, before it was diminished by war: no, not all that was at Delphi, which abounded with the richest offerings.

Οὐδ' ὅσα λαῖνος ἔδος Ἀθητορος ἐνδον ἐργεῖ
Φοῖβος Ἀπολλωνος Πυθοὶ ἐνὶ πετρῆεσσι.

Let any body cast his eye upon the lines, and judge, after considering them, whether *Ἀθητωρ* can possibly be an epithet: and whether it can be referred as a title to the word Apollo; which is so far disjoined from it. Can we suppose the poet to have been guilty of so unnatural an arrangement? To me it seems impossible. We may I think con-

clude, that Aphetor was a tower at Delphi : and the natural purport of the words is this. *No*, says Achilles ; no wealth can persuade me. Not all, that *the stony threshold* of the Aphetor, *that is* the fire-tower, *contains ; which belongs to Apollo ; and is at his oracular seat at Delphi.* Such I imagine to be the meaning of λαῖνος ἄδος Αῤητορος : by which is signified a strong well-built tower, of a firm basis. Strabo affords good proof, that my opinion is not ill-founded : and his authority is very early, and of more weight, than that of any grammarian. He tells us expressly, that the Aphetor was looked upon as a strong place, or tower. *Ενιοι δε τον Αῤητορα δεξαμενοι λεγεσθαι θησαυρον, Αῤητορος δε ἔδον τον κατα γης θησαυρισμον, εν τῳ ναῳ καταρυχθαι φασι τον πλυστον. ἐκείνον δε της περι Ονομαρχου επιχειρησαντας ανασκαπτειν νυκτωρ. κτλ. L. 9. p. 644.* We learn from hence, that there were people, who maintained, that the Aphetor was a treasury at Delphi : and the λαῖνος ἄδος was the basis of the tower ; the strong repository, where the gold and costly presents were preserved. It was moreover a part of the temple ; and a sanctuary : which however was undermined by Onomarchus, and some others. He styles, we find, Αῤητωρ, θησαυρος ; and by θησαυρος according to Hesychius was meant, *εις αγαλματων και χρηματων η ιερων αποθεσιν οικος : an edifice for the security of things of great value : statues, &c.* Hence Aphetor was not a title, but a place : and the λαῖνος ἄδος was the strong magazine of this particular tower, in which things of consequence were deposited. There seems to have been another ancient name for this building, as may be inferred from the Scholiast before quoted. He says, Αῤητορος—ητοι ὁμοφητορος : and then gives this strange reason for its being also denominated Ὅμοφητωρ.—ὁμοιως πασι προφητευομενα—τωτε πενητι, τωτε πλυσιω. *It was called Omophetor, be-*
cause

cause the god was so good-natured, as to prophecy to all alike, to the poor as well as to the rich. What stuff! The name he confesses, related to a place of prophecy; and was in some degree analogous to Aphetor. It was certainly an ancient appellation, which has been misunderstood, and perverted by the insertion of a single letter. Instead of Αφητορος, ητοι Ομοφητορος, the original reading was undoubtedly—Αφητορος, ητοι Ομφητορος: *The Aphetor was the same as the Omphetor, or the place of prophecy; the seat of the Omphē.* This was the original reading: but a latter scholiast has changed both the word, and its purport; and then added his own idle gloss. From what has been said, we may be certain, that the term Aphetor was not an epithet, but the name of a place. For this we have the authority of persons, mentioned by Strabo: who never dreamt, that it had any relation to αφεισις, and αφημι; or that it was a title of Apollo. They speak of it, as a place of strength, and one of the principal parts of the temple at Delphi. They moreover mention it, as the treasury, which they confirm by a known history of its having been attacked, and undermined. We find moreover, that it was not only stiled Aphe-tor, but also Omphē-tor; as it was both a tower of light, and a place of prophecy, the seat of the oracle. Beneath was the treasury mentioned before; in which, on account of its great sanctity all the rich gifts were laid up.

He censures, what I have said about the word *lympa*: which he says is derived from λιμφος. *Lympha est λιμφα, a λιμφος versatilis, fallax: a λιβω, λειβω, λειπω.* p. 75. But can it possibly be imagined, that water in general could receive its name from motivity and fallacy. The case is quite the reverse. λιμφος is a sycophant and cheat: and there is another word λιμφευειν; which signifies

fies to cozen, and deceive. But if they have any relation to lympha, they are derivatives from it; being metaphors taken from streams and waters; whose instability and deceitfulness are proverbial. Not that there can be any real deceit or fraud in this element: the mischief arises from people, who deceive themselves; and venture farther, than they are warranted by reason. But if the imputation were true: yet can we suppose, that pure limpid water, an element so beautiful and beneficial, could have all its natural properties overlooked: that it could be noted only for a seeming defect; and named from cheating, and deceiving. It cannot with any truth be imagined. The Latin word lympha is a primitive term; and not a derivative of a derivative: nor to be deduced first from λιμφορ, or λιμφενειν; and then from λιβω, λειβω, λειπω.

The like censure is cast upon my opinion about Nympha a water deity, which I have supposed to be so named from oracular influence. This is totally set aside by my annotator: who tells us, Νυμφη mulier, vel virgo obvelata, ab antiquo νυπτω, νυβω, unde latinum nubo. Be it so: but what is this to the present purpose? He does not consider, that he is treating of another subject, and a different appellation, however expressed the same. The one is a real person, νεογαμος: and denominated from a veil. The other is an ideal character, a person supposed to preside over waters, and represented as a virgin, and generally naked: consequently had nothing to do with a veil. We may as well imagine that αργος, albus, and αργος, velox: that βιος, vita, and βιος, arcus: ιος jaculum, and ιος, ærugo: ναω habito, and ναω fluo, are of the same purport, and original; as to suppose the foregoing words. The goat in the heavens, ἡ ἐν τοῖς ἀστροῖς αἴξ, was called Nympha. What has this to do with a veil,

veil, or with the rights of marriage? The same may be said of the Muses, and other fictitious personages. There were many places named from the Nymphs, and stiled Nympha, Nymphæa, Nymphæum, Nymphais, Nympharene: also Nympharum Insulæ, Nympharum Fanum, Nympharum Cubile: most of which were far removed from Greece. This shews, that the word was of foreign original; and probably of great antiquity; and it could have no relation to *νυβω* & *νυπτω*, *to veil and cover*. By Nymphæum was generally signified an hollow place, some sacred cavern, abounding with water: and the Nympha, who presided over it was a prophetic deity: quite a different character from the *γυνή νεογάμος*; and from the mulier velata of the Romans. There were nymphs of the mountains, nymphs of the groves; but they seem for the most part to have presided over waters.

Nymphæ, Lauretes Nymphæ, genus omnibus unde est. *Æneid.* 8. v. 71.

Hence it was, that I imagined the term Nympha to relate to prophecy: and that these deities were supposed to inspire persons is plain from many passages in Pausanias, see L. 4. p. 344. L. 7. p. 709: and other writers: and particularly from the word *νυμφοληπτος* in Hesychius. *Νυμφοληπτοι, οἱ κατεχομενοι Νυμφαις· Μαντις δ' εἰσι, καὶ ἐπιθειεστικοι.* *The Nympholepti are persons inspired by the nymphs: for such persons are prophetic and have a particular energiac influence.* Strabo mentions a place near Apollonia

* We see above from Virgil, that all rivers were derived from the Nymphs. Nymphæ—genus omnibus unde est. But we know, that rivers proceed from fountains; therefore the Nympha were only fountains personated. We moreover find from various writers that both the nymphs, and the fountains, over

Apollonia in Illyria called Nymphæum. It was a rock, which emitted flames; and at the bottom there issued forth some hot bituminous streams: L. 7. p. 487. And we are farther told by Dion Cassius, that these streams were esteemed oracular: L. 41. p. 174. If then the words Nympha and Nymphæum are so intimately connected with fountains, and prophecy; why is it thought unnatural to deduce them from terms, which are expressive of those characteristics: especially as they cannot possibly be made to agree with others, to which they are generally referred?

He does not at all agree with me about the etymology of the word *Ομφη*, *Omphe*; which he interprets, *visio*, *dictum*. For he insists, that, as *Ρομφη*, *gladius*, is formed from *ροπτω*, *Ριμφη*, *jactus*, from *ριπτω*, *Ραμφη*, and *Ραμφος*, *rostrum*, from *ραπτω*, so surely was *Ομφη* from *οπω* and *οπτω*, to *see*, and to *speak*: for *Omphe*, he says, signified properly *visio*, *dictum*. We have three things here intimated, which are intirely groundless. First, it is taken for granted, that the word in dispute was of Greek original: which it was not. In the second place, that it re-

over which they presided, were supposed to have an oracular influence, and to be prophetic. What then is more natural, than to deduce the name of Nympha from terms, which relate to those objects. Therefore as *An* signifies a fountain, and *Omphe* is an oracle, I have supposed *Νυμφη* to have been denominated originally *Αν-ομφη*: *Νυμφαία*, *Ανομφαία*: *Νυμφαιον*, *Ανομφαιον*. This *Ανομφη* after an aphæresis came to be expressed *Νυμφη*; and *Ανομφαιον*, *Νυμφαιον*, *Nymphæum*. Thus the river *Astura* was rendered *Stura*: the city *Egbatana*, *Batana*: *Adora*, *Dora*: *Emerita*, *Merida*. *Ilerda*, *Lerda* and *Lerida*. But what has a stricter analogy, the nymph *Anait* of Armenia and Persia was expressed *Nait*, whence came the *ναϊς*, *ναϊδης* of Greece: and *Egnatia*, which was the same name, *Agnait*: and given to an Appulian fountain-nymph, and to a city denominated from her, is rendered by Horace *Gnatia*. It is at this day called *Torre di Anasso*.

lated

lated to sight : which is equally untrue : and thirdly that the verbs *οπω*, *οπτω*, and consequently *οπτομαι*, had a reference to speech ; which is contrary to all experience. *Ομφη*—ab *οπω*, *οπτω*, video, dico. p. 75. As we have here communicated to us two very different ideas, I should be glad to know, which is the truth ; and to which the word in dispute belongs : for it cannot have two different etymologies. Nor can we suppose these verbs to have each such contrary senses ; and relate at the same time both to *vision*, and to *voice*. This must be the case, if they are synonymous. If they are not, then the word must have two different, and contradictory derivations : which it would be absurd to imagine. In short we might as well suppose the verb *ακω* to mean both to hear and to smell. And though there may be instances of a verb having two senses ; yet no example of this sort can be admitted without good authority. In the first place, there are no such words as *οπω* and *οπτω* ; nor even *οπτομαι* : and in the next place, if we suppose, that any such once existed, yet by all the tenses, and all the compounds, that can possibly be deduced from them, we must know, that they related to sight. *ωφθην*, *ωπα*, *οπωπα*, *οψος*, *εποπτης*, *προοπτης*, *υπεροπτης*, with numberless others, have all a reference to seeing, and to that only. And as to the word *ομφη*, which he says, was properly visio, *a vision* : it certainly was not so. It signified truly *vox divina* : and though this intimation was sometimes given in dreams ; yet the *Omphe* itself related to speech and sound : and it was often described as openly and externally exhibited, without any dream, or vision. Hesychius tells us, *Ομφη*, *φημη θεια*, *κληδων θεια*, *φωνη*, *δοξα*, *πνοη*, *ονειρα φαντασματα*. Five out of these six instances do not come under the cognizance of the eye : and the sixth appears only to fancy.

fancy. The God of Sleep gave intelligence in a dream to Agamemnon ; and informed him of Jupiter's commands. The hero at the close awoke, *Θειη δε μιν ἀμφεχούτ' ὀμφη.* Iliad. B. v. 41. *and the divine voice seemed still to be around him.* Upon this the Scholiast observes, that the Omphē was *Θεια φημὴ καὶ κληδὼν: divine intimation by words, heavenly intelligence.* In the Odyssey we find the words *ἐπισπομενοὶ δῖος ὀμφη.* Γ. v. 215. which the Scholiast again explains, by *χρησμῶ, κληδονί, μαντεία.* These are not necessarily connected with dreams, or visions: much less with the faculty of seeing. In the Orphic Argonautica the poet speaks of Idmon ; to whom Apollo had given the power of prophecy.

Τῷ καὶ μαντοσύνην ἔπορε καὶ θεσφατον ὀμφην.

v. 188.

Θεσφατος is the same, as *θεοφατος* : and the faculty bestowed upon Idmon was a power of uttering the words of the Deity. The same poet speaking of the divine harmony of Orpheus describes it by the term *ὀμφη.*

Οἱ ῥα τὴν μίμνεσι χελὺν, καὶ θεσκελὸν ὀμφην.

v. 87.

Orpheus is likewise made to speak to the same purpose, when he is describing his own musick.

Καὶ τότε γὰρ φορμιγγὸς ἐφηρμὸσα θεσκελὸν ὀμφην.

v. 999.

How can the tone of a harp relate to vision, or be derived from *ὄπω*, or *ὀπτω* ; any more than the words of a deity ? Pindar speaking of Hercules says, that within a particular interval of time he was twice honoured, and ushered in with the solemn shouts, and praises of the Athenians.

Δις Ἀθηναίων μιν ὀμφαί κωμάσαν.

Nem : I. v. 63.

Here the word ὀμφαί in the plural signifies the acclamations of the people at a sacred festival. In all these instances there was no dream nor vision. Many other examples might be brought to the same purpose : from which, I think, we may be certain, that the word was not derived from ὀπτω, or ὀπτομαι : and that it can have no relation to fight; but to speech solely.

As the author renders ὀπτω, *dico* ; he may avail himself of a passage in Hesychius, where it is said that the word οψ related both to vision and words. Οψ, οψις, οφθαλμος, φημη. For as ὀπτομαι is so closely connected with οψ, he may presume, that it has two significations. But this is contrary to all experience. Besides there are here, as in other instances, two words alluded to by Hesychius under the same characters. What they were originally may be known by their oblique cases : for from thence the true nominative is to be found. It may also be traced in the derivatives. We may learn from οπα, and ευρυοπα, that the word οψ, which signifies φημη, a voice, was originally οπισ; and afterwards contracted. We may also be certain, that the other word, which signified vision, was properly οψις, quite distinct from the former : and so it is always expressed. For, notwithstanding what is said by Hesychius, οψ, visio never, I believe, occurs. It is indeed mentioned by Strabo ; but merely as a peculiarity ; and to be found in one writer only. L. 8. p. 560. Had Hesychius produced the oblique cases, which are in use, there could have been no uncertainty, nor * confusion. But though there may be instances of primitives being sometimes found similar, yet by their tenses and

* Οψ, οψις, οφθαλμος. οψ, οπος, φημη.

inflexions,

inflexions, and by an uniform analogy, we may discover their true purport. Οψ, οπος, vox, is said by grammarians to be derived from επω, and ειπω, dico. And Οψ, οψις, visio, from οπτω, and οπτομαι, video. Επω, and ειπω, can never signify to see: nor οπτω, and οπτομαι, to speak. It is therefore very wrong to render οπτω, dico: and it would be equally blameable to suppose οψ, οπος, vox, to have any relation to οψις; which is deduced from a verb of a very different signification.

What I have said of the ancient word Alphi or Alpha, has been treated with equal contempt. I have supposed it, like the word Omphi, to relate to prophecy; and to signify *the mouth or voice of God*: in other words *divine intelligence*. Many evidences were produced by me: but they have been all set aside, as not worthy the least consideration. Yet, I think, there is great truth in my supposition, and that it may serve as a clue, to clear up many difficult histories, and to correct some mistakes. There is a remarkable passage in the book of Exodus, where Moses appears backward towards the performing of God's orders, because he is not *eloquent*, but *slow of speech*. *And the Lord said unto Moses, who hath made man's mouth?—Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee, what thou shalt say.* C. 4. v. 11. 12. In another place the Deity tells him,—*See, I have made thee a God, unto Pharaoh.* C. 7. v. 1. Now it is observable, that Ptolemy Hephæstion says expressly, that Moses was called Alpha by the Egyptians: which is the same as Alphi. Μωσης, ὁ τῶν Ἑβραίων νομοθετής, ἀλφὰ ἐκαλεῖτο. apud Photium. Sect. cxc. p. 485. As this writer did not know the purport of the word, he would insinuate, that it was given, because the prophet has white vitiligenous spots upon his body: *δια το αλφας εχειν επι τῃ σωματος.* The like account is

is found in Helladius Bezaninois: and he entertains the same idle surmise about the origin of the appellation; quoting Philo for his authority. Apud Photium. Sect. clxxix. p. 1578. At present it is sufficient to observe, that the prophet was really called Alpha. There was a groundless notion, which of old prevailed, that the children of Israel in Egypt, had a leprous disorder. This has been inferred from Apion: but he says nothing, that comes up to the purpose. He only takes notice, that a disorder of this kind was among the people of Egypt; and mentions that they had a particular place assigned for their abode. If the Israelites in general had this distemper, how could there have been that intercourse, which appears plainly to have subsisted, between them and the people of the country? How could Aaron and his family have been admitted among the household of Pharaoh; where they are said to have resided? As to Moses, he had been forty years away: and when he returned, he was immediately introduced to the presence of Pharaoh, and to the princes of his court. This could not have happened, if there had been any such infection, as is surmised. Accordingly Photius calls

Φλυαρει και ουτος τον Μωσην Αλφα λεγεσθαι δια το αλφοις το σωμα κατασικτος ην. και καλει τε ψευδης τον Φιλωνα μαρτυρα. *He too (as well as Ptolemy Hephestion) talks idly, when he supposes, that Moses was called Alpha from having his body marked with (αλφοις) white spots. And he is guilty of a forgery in presuming to quote Philo to that purpose.* p. 1578. Philo indeed takes notice, that Moses by the Egyptians was stiled a Deity. He mentions, that the prophet had names from the circumstances of his life. He was called Moses from *mo*, and *mos*, water: he was also stiled ανθρωπος Θεος, *or the man of God*, from

his immediate intercourse with the Deity : Ἦνικα δὲ Αἰγυπτος τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀσθενηθέντων δικὰς ἐκτίνει, τὸ βασιλευντος τῆς χώρας Φαραῶ (προσαγορεύεται) Θεός. *But when the land of Egypt through him is afflicted with judgments for the wickedness of the people, he is then stiled the God of Pharaoh.* De Nom. mutatione. Vol. 1. p. 597. Such were the titles given to the prophet : and among these none was more remarkable, than that of Alpha ; of which I first treated ; and concerning the purport of which there can be no doubt. We have seen how the Deity promised Moses, that he would *make him a God unto Pharaoh.* And as he was *slow of speech, and of a slow tongue,* God asks him, *who hath made man's mouth ?—have not I the Lord ? Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth : and teach thee, what thou shalt say.* After this what could be more natural than for Moses to be called by the Egyptians *the mouth or oracle of God ?* And as we are informed by writers, that he was called Alpha ; how can we doubt of the propriety of the appellation : as Alpha, which is only a variation of Alphi, literally signifies, *Os Dei, sive vox divina.* The etymology is, I think, manifest ; and the whole affords much evidence towards the confirmation of the sacred history. The name of Moses was well known, and greatly revered by people of the east. Diodorus Siculus gave an ample history of him, and of the Jewish nation in his fortieth book : part of which is still extant. There are many things, which are not accurately, nor even truly, exhibited : yet the account is curious ; and the character of this wonderful person is in many respects fairly delineated. Among other things he tells us, that at the close of the laws given to the Jews these extraordinary words were subjoined, Μωσῆς, ἀκρσας τὸ Θεὸς, τὰδε λέγει τοῖς Ἰσραηλίοις. *These institutes were given*

given by Moses, which he received immediately from the mouth of God. Such is the purport of the words : and we need not wonder after these testimonies, if we find, that he was stiled Alpha, or *the oracle of the Deity.* I mention these additional circumstances, in confirmation of my system ; which should not be so lightly set aside.

Throughout the whole of these animadversions my opponent has shewn too much severity and contempt. He has however in one place paid me an indirect compliment ; which undoubtedly he never intended. He intimates, that my purpose was certainly noble, and my system of such consequence, that whoever should compleat even the least part, would be intitled to more honour from history and historians, than all the ancients and moderns collectively have ever deserved. But he says I have totally failed. *Hujus tam lautæ, tamque magnificæ, spei, quam nobis fecit Bryantius, si vel minimam partem absolvisset, fatendum esset, tantum eum de historiæ veritate meritum esse, quantum vix omnes ii, qui unquam apud antiquos et hodiernos in eâ memoriæ prodendâ operam posuerunt.* p. 59. Such was my plan : and such the fair hopes, which I gave to the world ; but the whole is an utter disappointment. I have failed, it seems, throughout : not the least part of what I promised, has been performed. This is hard : and rather discouraging : but—*Dii meliora piis :* I hope things are not so bad as represented. There are people in the world, who think far otherwise : persons too of rank, as well as learning : of reasoning heads, and cool judgment. Some of them are deeply versed in oriental knowledge, and in science of every kind. My good friend will not allow this : for he looks upon them as people of weak understanding ; who have been seduced, and

deceived. He speaks of me as an arrant cheat, who have led astray the learned men of my country; and imposed upon the metropolis. *Nos quidem sapius in eam cogitationem incidimus, ut eum totâ hâc scriptione ludere eruditam civitatem, eique fumum objicere velle putaremus.* p. 78. But what an abject opinion must he entertain of those learned men, who, he confesses, have done me honour, if they could be made dupes to a person so low, as he represents me! He must certainly think, that all true judgment and penetration are blessings confined to himself; and to the little circle, in which he is conversant.

In a work like mine, where the system is so new, and at the same time abounds with matter, it is not to be wondered at, if some slips should be perceived. And as to the etymological part, the plan may be well founded; and yet the execution of it not in every degree perfect. Others may come after, and render compleat, what is as yet defective. A person of a liberal turn would not take advantage of every little uncertainty; should any such here and there appear: much less would he enhance and aggravate, what human nature cannot avoid. At all rates he would not be guilty of an untruth, and invent matter of accusation where the writer himself is guiltless. Yet this my opponent does: and of this more than one instance may be produced. He accuses me of deriving *Pisa* from *Phanes*: a circumstance, which never came into my head: also of deriving the word *puer* from *os lucis*. p. 77. which is an express contradiction to what he said 69: and which was my real meaning. To this he adds—*ignorabat laconicum wais et wais pro wais*. By this he would intimate two things; first that these two antiquated terms were from the Attic: which is a strange conception. For the Attic dia-
lect

lect was a branch of the old Ionic : which he would here make the parent of the Doric, the most ancient dialect of all. And secondly by introducing these two obsolete terms he would persuade us through the help of this medium, that the Latin word puer was the same as the Greek *παις*, and originally from it. But who can possibly think that any relation ever subsisted between them? Let any person consider the words themselves, and then their inflexions, and judge, if puer, pueri, can be a derivative of *παις*, *παιδος* : or that pueros and puerorum have any relation to *παιδες* and *παιδων*. He says of me,—*fere sonum et aures sequi*. Of this fault I will certainly acquit him. He is not directed by sound, nor has he any ear to follow ; as is evident from what he has here said. It is true the learned Scaliger had a notion of the same kind ; and thought, as the persons stiled *pueri* were often servants, and pedissequi, that the name was originally from the Laconian word *πορ*, a foot. *Πορ*, *πες* *Λακωνες*. Hesych. See Conject. in Varronis de Ling. Lat. Lib. p. 45. In consequence of this, if puer and *παις* be the same, only in different dialects : then as puer is from *πορ*, so *παις* must be by the same analogy from *πες*. But this is too idle to be supposed. Hesychius gives us this description, or rather definition, of *παις*. *Παις ὁ φύσει υἱὸς ἄντινος, καὶ ὁ ἡλικία νεός, καὶ ἀντι παρθένου*. *It signifies a boy, one who is by nature the son of another ; who is also young of age ; and it is the opposite of a girl*. Who would think, that a term of such a purport could be derived from a foot ? He upbraids me with not knowing, that there was such a verb as *φαεθω*, to shine ; nor that the proper name Phaethon was derived from it. He did not know it himself : for there is no such verb. He takes the name Phaethon for a participial ; and then makes

use of a feigned verb for a radix: Phaethon like Apion, Manethon, was a foreign term of great antiquity: consequently not to be derived from any word in the Grecian tongue.

I am sorry to say, that he puts an unnatural strain upon every thing, which I introduce, in order to make me appear inconsistent. At the same time he was certainly not sufficiently master of the language, in which I have written: as will appear to any person, who will turn to the passages, of which he takes notice, and particularly to the following remark. *Hebræos Scriptores ait nomina nunquam ad suam pronuntiandi consuetudinem immutasse; at hujus sententiæ contrarium affirmatur p. 198. quanquam hoc non adeo reprehendendum videtur in eo, qui ipse se sibi repugnaturum profitetur p. 173.* As to the first part, whoever has my book in their hands, may see, that the very contrary is said in the pages referred to. The allegation is contradicted in every line. And as to my giving out at the beginning, that in the course of my writing I should be knowingly in opposition to myself, it will not, I trust, be thought possible. For an author at the commencement of his work to tell his readers beforehand, that he shall contradict himself, and be guilty of inconsistency, would be a manner of proceeding, as absurd, as inexcusable. The question is, Are these things so? Did I ever give such previous notice of any future disagreement, and that one part of my work would be in opposition to the other: for this is the thing intimated? Let us attend to my words, referred to in the page specified, 173. *There will also be found some instances, where I differ from myself, and go contrary to positions in a former treatise.* Now what has this to do with the present work, which is the immediate subject of controversy: and which has been covertly al-
luded

luded to in these unjust strictures? What he speaks of, as contradictions in one treatise, are emendations of another published several years before. It is farther said by me—*These instances are very few, and of no great moment; being such as probably would escape the reader's notice. But I think it more ingenuous, and indeed my strict duty, to own my mistakes, &c. rather than to idly defend them.* These are my words: and let these instances be few, or many, what are they to the present purpose? The subject of inquiry is the Analysis: upon which the Annotator is giving his opinion: and he intimates to the unwary reader, that I have not only been guilty of repeated inconsistency; but that I gave notice beforehand, that I should be in opposition to myself. But when we turn to the passage, from whence he makes his inference, we find the whole charge to be groundless: and that he has been guilty of a gross misrepresentation. What he calls inconsistency in one work, is merely a proposed correction of another: which other he probably never saw, nor would deign to look into. He condemns me, where he ought to have given me praise: for he is the first, who ever shewed an antipathy to improvement; and aspersed a person for having rendered an edition either *auctior* or *emendatior*.

Other examples to the same purpose might be produced: but as this inquest will prove as tiresome, as it is unedifying, I will draw towards a conclusion, taking my leave of him, just where he concludes with me. The following is the last of his strictures, as extraordinary as any, that have preceded: which will farther shew how inaccurate and unfair he is. He says, that I make the names Hercynia and Pyrene to be absolutely synonymous, and of the same etymology. Now the truth is, that there was a mountain Pyrene in Spain,

and another of the same name among the Alps. These I suppose to have been named from the same cause: and I give my reasons accordingly: but of any similitude between Pyrene and Hercynia not one syllable is said. Notwithstanding this my kind adversary has the following remarks: in which he sets out with a gross mistake. Hercyniam et Pyrenam ejusdem potestatis nomina esse, rationibus etymologiæ suæ, demonstrat; eique opinioni fidem Cluverii auctoritate, quem Hercyniæ Sylvæ initium a Pyrene, unâ ex Alpibus Tridentinis, duxisse dicit. At locum Cluverii nec ipsis verbis protulit; nec paginæ numero significavit: neque omnino facile erat: cum nil ejusmodi in libris de Germania extet. p. 78. This is a bitter accusation: and amounts to little less than forgery: and I own, that I deserve every thing, that has been imputed to me, if I am found guilty. There can be no way to form a judgment but by seeing the very words, upon which these strictures are made. The figures prefixed relate to the authors quoted. *There was a Pyrene among the Alpes* ⁷⁸ *Tridentinæ, and at the foot of it a city of the same* ⁷⁹ *name: which one would infer to have been denominated from the same circumstance (as the Pyrene spoken of before.) I mention this, because here was the regio Hercynia, where the Hercynian forest* ⁸⁰ *commenced, and from whence it received its name. Vol. 1. p. 211. What one circumstance is here, which could induce him to say, that I made no distinction between Hercynia and Pyrene: but supposed them to be of the same etymology? To aver, that I quote Cluver for that purpose; and found my opinion upon his evidence: when I do not apply to him at all in this instance; but have recourse to* ⁷⁸ *Pliny, Seneca, and Aristotle, for one article; and to* ⁷⁹ *Herodotus for another.* ἵστος τε γὰρ ποτα-

μος ἀρξάμενος ἐκ Κελτῶν, καὶ Πυρηνῆς πολίος ῥέσι. L. 3.
C. 33. This historian mentions a city Pyrene; but others take notice only of a mountain, which was the same as the Hercynian mountain, Ἐρκυνιον ὄρος of Stephanus Byzantinus: the same probably, which is now called the great Brenner. It stood at the extremity of the Tridentine and Rhætian Alps, which were esteemed the same: and here was the beginning of the great Hercynian forest.

Prominet Hercyniæ confinis Rhætia Sylvæ.

Claudian de bello Getico. v. 330.

Among these Rhætian Alps was one of the principal sources of the Danube: the same which is alluded to by Aristotle; and by Herodotus; though the latter has in some measure confounded the geography. Here it is likewise placed by Strabo L. 7. p. 448. 9. But the most remote, and most noted, source was in the mountain Abnoba in the region of the Rauraci.

Still, says my annotator, you should have given us *Cluver's words*. But how could I quote Cluver's words, for that, which I did not suppose him to say? Why should I mention an authority, to which I do not appeal? When I have occasion to apply to this author, I refer to him plainly. And though it is said, that he has nothing to my purpose, and indeed he has not to the purpose assigned me; yet to my real purpose he has a great deal. For he has most of the authorities, to which I appeal; and many others, of which I do not make use, to the amount of nine or ten folio pages: and this will be evident to any body who will consult him de Saltu et Sylva Hercynia, et de fluminibus Germaniæ. It was upon this account, that at the close I referred the reader to Cluver at large; not for that author's opinion, nor for any particular article, but for a
general

general view of the whole : as he would find several pages intirely to this purpose : so far is Cluver from being silent. Now let any body look back, and consider what has been urged against me : that I make Hercynia and Pyrene the same in signification : that I quote Cluver's authority for this opinion : but that I do not give his words : nor mention either chapter or page : and that I acted cunningly in so doing ; for he had not a syllable to my purpose. How fatal are these misrepresentations : and what a number of mistakes have arisen from a passage, as plain, as can be worded. And here I will do so far justice to my adversary, as to believe, that he did not misrepresent me wilfully. I cannot be induced to think that he was capable of so foul a deed. These mistakes were undoubtedly owing to his not being sufficiently master of the language, in which my sentiments are expressed. I think, that I can perceive this in some other instances. Yet after all he should have been more temperate and cautious, in what he has advanced ; and not have endeavoured to ruin a work, with the language and purport of which he was not duly acquainted : a work too, which he acknowledges to be of so great consequence, that if it were in any degree compleated, the author would deserve of history quantum vix omnes ii, qui unquam apud antiquos et hodiernos in eâ memoriæ prodendâ operam posuerunt suam. This is a very great compliment, which I know not how to take to myself ; both because I do not deserve it ; and because it was not intended. Yet it serves to shew his opinion of my plan ; and as it comes from a bitter enemy, it must have some weight. Towards the conclusion of his observations he indeed mentions, that he could say something about my erudition, but *the nature of his work did not permit*. It was
not

not, I fear, the nature of the work ; but the nature of the man, which prevented. At all rates I am obliged to him for his silence. However, setting this aside ; though he may have been ever so backward in speaking in my favour, far be it from me to act in the same manner, and to abridge him of any thing which is his due. And here I freely grant him every qualification, which he has denied to me. I make no doubt, but he is versed in the Arabic and Persian tongues ; and well acquainted with the Hebrew. I will allow him to know the genius of the Roman and Greek languages : and to be an excellent grammarian. But the world will not acquiesce in these attainments : there are people, who will look out for something more. They will require arguments, as well as censures ; and sound reasoning, as well as grammatical nicety. They may possibly go still farther ; and amid these heavy allegations, expect some tincture of liberality : some portion of candour and truth. He acknowledges, that my work has been approved of, and commended, by many learned men : *librum ab hominibus doctis non paucis laudatum probatumque.* p. 54. But, it seems, there are others of more sense, and of greater learning, who see things in a different light ; and hold the author in sovereign contempt.—*doctioribus tamen nugari videtur.* p. 78. Of whom this select body may be composed, is uncertain. I wish, it were my fortune to be known to them : they would form a more favourable opinion both of my principles and practice.

✓

AN
A P O L O G Y

T O

JOHN RICHARDSON, Esq.

Of the MIDDLE TEMPLE, and of WADHAM COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

By the S A M E.

A P O C Y

JOHN RICHARDSON, D.

Of the Ministry, and of the Christian Church

By the Rev. Mr. Richardson

A N

A P O L O G Y, &c.

I Had scarcely finished the above defence; when another Treatise made its appearance, in which are some strictures of a different nature upon me, and my work. This is by no means like the former a dry and scholastic business; the offspring of a dull grammarian: but a composition highly coloured and embellished: abounding with tropes and figures, and enriched with a multiplicity of learning: so that we are bewildered in the variety of entertainment. The author's purpose is to give an account of the languages, literature, and manners of eastern people. And he seems in many instances to have copied the lively turn of those nations; for he does not confine himself to that unnecessary grammatical exactness, to which we generally think ourselves bound to attend: nor is he a slave to that rigid and logical method of reasoning; which has prevailed among us for some time. In short he does not scruple to expatiate freely, and to deviate sometimes from the subject matter, whenever new views open; and his fancy is caught by fresh appearances.

He has been led to think from an unfortunate line in my first volume, that I have spoken irreverently

irreverently of the Persic and Arabic languages; for which he very justly entertains a great esteem. On this account some pages in his Treatise are taken up with shewing me my great mistake: but chiefly (what may not appear altogether to the purpose) with pointing out many fundamental errors in the historical part of my own writings. The nature of my offence in its full extent cannot be better described than in his own words. *Among other learned men, who apparently from an idea of their modern date have disputed the utility of the Arabic and Persian languages, is the ingenious author of the New System, or Analysis of Ancient Mythology: a work, in which the novel ingenuity of the Analytic System, the penetration, and judgment displayed in the refutation of vulgar errors, with the new and informing light, in which he has placed a number of ancient facts, leaves the learned world the regret, that this classical writer had not to his singular knowledge in the Greek and Roman literature, added some tincture of the languages and learning of the east. As there however appears an impropriety in any person's condemning, what he confessedly does not understand: and as this learned Gentleman has attacked a province, which I conceive it my duty to defend; I shall endeavour to remove some prejudices, which he may have created: as the errors of a writer of uncommon abilities, who has laid down canons for future history, may have a more dangerous tendency, than the mistakes of inferiour men: whom few read: and still fewer follow. Dissert. p. 87.* All this, I must confess, is very humane and polite. We see here attributed to me, learning, penetration, judgment; attended with much informing light; and a particular degree of knowledge in the Greek, and Roman languages: and at the close I am represented as a person of abilities. Though I cannot pretend

to deserve one half of what is here said, yet I ought to think myself greatly obliged to this gentleman for his candour and good opinion: and shall be sorry to find any thing, as I proceed, that may lessen the obligation.

The great mistake, which entitled me to his observations consisted in *my condemning what I did not understand; and in attacking a province, which he thought it his duty to defend: in short in having disputed the utility of the Persian and Arabic languages.* He therefore thought it necessary to remove some of the prejudices, which I had created. In answer to this I can only say, that I am ready to recant every thing, which I have unduly asserted, when he shall state to me my unfair course of reasoning. I shall gladly make an apology: and give the utmost satisfaction; if satisfaction can be given. But let all those expressions be first brought together, the whole process of my argument, wherein I have disputed the utility of these tongues, and condemned them. I mention this, because they must necessarily have been very copious to have caused this alarm. This is the great point, to which we are to attend: and this being satisfactorily disclosed, I am ready to make due submission. Let us then attend to what immediately follows, that we may see, how these articles are made out.—*The chief points, which Mr. Bryant means to establish (in his Analysis) are, First the universality of the Deluge from Gentile authorities: Secondly the migration from Babel &c.: and Thirdly the Arkite ceremonies with the general worship of the sun and fire.* I shall not here dispute, whether these are the only great points, which I had in view: all that at present I should be glad to know, is, how this is to the purpose. I am accused of having treated Persian and Arabic literature

rature irreverently : of condemning, what I did not know ; and raising undue prejudices ; and it is natural to expect some proof of these crimes. But the author seems to have forgot himself : and instead of bringing any evidence in support of his allegations, turns aside ; and sets about an examen of my work. But what support can this possibly bring to his cause ? What relation can the universality of the deluge, or the history of the Arkite rites, have to the utility and excellence of any language upon earth ? But herein I may perhaps be too short-sighted : and he will probably tell me, if I had looked with any accuracy, I might have perceived at the end of the paragraph a small directing letter, which refers to the notes : and upon turning to them, I might have obtained what I wanted. I accordingly do turn ; and at last find the unfortunate lines, which have brought upon me these animadversions. They are as follow. *In our progress to obtain this knowledge (of ancient mythology) we must have recourse to the writers of Greece. It is in vain to talk about the Arabian and Persic literature of modern date, &c.* Here we may see the full extent of my fault : to which with grief I must subscribe. This is the whole ; and indeed somewhat more : on which account with due permission we will strike out the *et cætera* at the close : at it may induce readers to imagine, that there are other circumstances left behind, which out of candour are not mentioned. We will therefore make the sentence conclude with a full stop, just where it properly leaves off : for all, that follows, is foreign to the present purpose. — *It is in vain to talk about the Arabian or Persic literature of modern date.* From these few untoward words the author has been led to affirm, that I *disputed the utility of these languages* : that I
have

have condemned them; and raised *prejudices* against them. In this I am apt to think, that he goes too far. To say the truth I have a great opinion of the Arabian language: and the Persic may have equal merit. I only venture to surmise that they are not of so great antiquity, as the Grecian: and that the modern Persic cannot so surely lead us to the cognizance of ancient facts, as the early Greek. And if I am under a mistake, I believe, that ninety nine out of an hundred will be found in the same predicament. And here, if I might do it without offence, I would beg to be informed, why my words are not introduced in the text. My accusation stands manifest and at large; and is brought immediately under the eye of the reader. But the passage, upon which the whole depends, is placed out of sight in the rear; and can be obtained only by reference. The author probably perceived upon recollection, that no such inferences could be drawn from the premises: and that my words did not warrant such a bill of attainder. He has therefore kept them cautiously out of sight. And though some perhaps may think, that he has not acted quite fair: yet he has certainly by this manœuvre displayed great judgment. The only defect, that I can find, is, his forgetting the promised process. For after he has stated his allegations, and has prepared us for his vindication of the injured languages, the whole slips out of his mind, and is turned, as I have shewn, into an attack upon my writings in general. Now I am so short-sighted, that were all that I have written to be obliterated, every letter cancelled, I cannot conceive, how it could at all vindicate the Arabic language; or be a defence to the Persic. It is said of his friends the Tatars or Tartars, that if they kill a man, they think, they shall inherit his

good qualities. But whether the demolition of one character will prove the support of another I much question. But as he is pleased to put things upon this issue, I will carefully follow, where he leads; and quitting the cause of the Orientals attend to what he says of my work. His comment begins in this manner. *The chief points, which Mr. B. wants to establish, are, First, the universality of the Deluge from Gentile authorities. Secondly the migration after the Babel dispersion of the people, whom he calls Cuthites, or Amonians.* Every body without doubt has a right to canvas, what I have written: and they have my full leave to pass sentence accordingly. But there is one thing previous, which with submission I think should be required: and this is, that they read, before they comment; and understand, before they condemn. For to be sure, my kind opponent hath cast his eye rather superficially over my work; and excepting in some instances, where he has borrowed, he does not seem to be so fully master of the subject, as I could have wished. In respect to my establishing the universality of the Deluge upon Gentile authority, I do not recollect, that this was my stated purpose. It is upon the authority of the Scriptures, that I found this history: which Scriptures I quote at large. By Gentile evidence I illustrate the same; and bring additional proof to its confirmation. As to the *migration* of the Cuthites *after the Babel dispersion*, I fear the whole is here misapprehended; and, as the poet says, *confusion is worse confounded.* The Cuthites were the very people of the dispersion: and the *migration* was a different event, antecedent to the other, which the author makes subsequent. The Amonians, of whom he speaks, were collectively the offspring of Amon, the same as Ham. Why does he
limit

limit the title to the Cuthites, who were one branch only; when it related to the whole family? It is true, that I admire his vivacity, and quickness in deciding, though I smart for it. Yet it is a pity, as he teems with words even to a degree of superfoetation, that he is not as curious as abundant.

The third point, into which he divides my work, consists of the *Arkite rites* with the *worship of fire*. How truly this is laid down, I shall not here contest. Let us attend to his observations upon these heads: and first upon the proofs of the Deluge. — *With regard to the first great event, I shall only observe in general, that the departing from the sacred writings to prove the destruction of mankind by pagan authorities, however laudable the intention, seems first to shake to the foundations the venerable fabrick, and then to prop it with a bullrush.* This is spoken so determinately, that I have hardly courage to make an answer. Thus much I must say, in respect to the fabrick mentioned, that nobody has a greater veneration for the old building than I have. But I am so backward of perception, that I cannot for the life of me see, how my departing from an edifice can thus shake it to its basis. The idea is noble and pleasing: yet I cannot conceive how merely retiring can be attended with such a convulsive influence. But in truth I never depart from the Scriptures. I have diligently abode by them, and will ever abide. But I still think, with submission, that we may afford them both illustration and support from writers of other countries: for I know not how to set aside as useless all collateral evidence. For the truth of the aphorism does not seem to me self-evident, that the using of foreign authorities is *propping with a bullrush*. The author however subjoins the fol-

lowing argument to support it. *For when recourse is had to feeble and imperfect evidence, a cause must be ever hurt in proportion to its failure.* This is clearly urged without the least equivocation. I believe, no oracle from the Tripod was ever more certain. But I fear upon examination we shall be found rather to beg the question. The subject is about our admitting of foreign evidence: now I suspect, that it will not be allowed us to suppose that, it is necessarily *feeble and imperfect*. We must read, learn, and distinguish, and then much good may result. External helps must not therefore be universally disallowed as useless: for at this rate we shall be obliged to insist, that the more light we obtain, the worse we see: and the more copious the evidence the weaker the proof. The author however proceeds to set aside all foreign authorities, which he terms Pagan: and endeavours to shew the absurdity of those persons, who have made application to such means. Yet writers of this sort have been very numerous, and some of them of tolerable repute, from Clemens and Tertullian down to Grotius, and Le Clerc. To these might be added the Cudworths, Stillingfleets, Pearsons, Cumberlands, Ushers, Marshams, Spencers, Newtons, with some others of our own nation; people, who in general have been well spoken of. Yet their method of reasoning is not thought just; and for the following reasons. *As if truth wanted the aid of fiction innumerable have been the attempts of the learned to establish by forced and unnatural constructions a conformity between the early history of the Hebrews, and the later fables of Greece, Egypt, and other ancient nations. From the fragments of Berosus, Abydenus, Sanchoniathon, Manetho, and other remote fablers, any thing, and every thing, may be drawn, which a lively imagination can suggest.* But
the

the working up such strange materials into any circumstance descriptive of Noab's deluge shews a warmth of fancy highly prepared for the reception of every thing marvellous. Whilst giving them all their utmost force, they prove at last precisely Nothing.—For ingenious men, if resolved to apply to profane materials in support of Scripture, ought to go to mountainous districts, and to countries far removed from the possibility of natural inundations. They ought to consider Hindostan, and other quarters of the world, where they positively refuse to believe this important era. Testimonies from such regions would be far more conclusive than hundreds of volumes from Egypt and Chaldaea. This is decisive work; and doing business to some purpose: yet I do not quite see the force of the argument. As to going to Hindostan, and to the other parts, which are mentioned; I cannot agree to it, and must beg to be excused: for it is a great deal too far. Indeed why should I take such a journey; when he confesses, there is no intelligence to be had, when I get there. I am sent in quest of Pagan materials; and it does not appear, that there is a shred or atom to be obtained. Ingenious men are particularly specified: but as to ingenuity I should think it quite superfluous. The dullest emissary, that ever was employed, would be too good upon such an expedition: for whatever pittance he carried out, he would bring just so much home, and no more. But, as I said before, I do not perceive the force of this argument, which is founded upon the disbelief of the Asiatics. There is towards the most southern point of Africa an high eminence, called the Table Mountain: and in Ceylon a high hill in the province of Conde Uda. If we were to ask a Caffre or a Cingalese of these parts about an universal deluge, they would probably, as the author

ingeniously expresses it, *refuse to believe this important era* : that is, in other words, they would be found to know nothing of the matter. This would undoubtedly be the case : yet I do not know how to think, that such dissent is quite sufficient to set aside any event, with which others may be better acquainted. We will grant, that the people in Hindostan do not believe this event. The reason is because they have no precise and authentic traditions about it : And the author mentions other people in the same situation. And he thinks this disbelief so cogent and convincing, that he would have ingenious men go to these countries for information. He looks upon this disbelief, when repeated, as a positive proof : and styles it in the plural testimonies. *Such testimonies*, says he, that is (what may at first appear a little strange) testimony without any evidence ; or (if I might be allowed so to explain the term) such ignorance, *would be far more conclusive than hundreds of volumes from Egypt and Chaldea*. Many will think, that this is rating disbelief too high. Indeed, the author seems to shew the same veneration for ignorance, as the Turks do for folly : who never see an idiot, but they think him inspired.

The mode of reasoning above is curious, but not new. The celebrated Mr. Hume in his elaborate discourse against miracles, follows it throughout : and his system is built upon it. In respect to past facts upon record he makes our not experiencing any thing analogous, either one way or the other, the same as our experiencing the direct contrary : and he enhances, what is a mere negative to positive knowledge. He assures us, that this argument will be of service as long as the world endures : and moreover that it is all his own. The latter part of his assertion I will
not

not pretend to dispute : nor do I know of any body that would rob him of the honour. As to any utility I confess, that I cannot perceive it. And though I am sensible, that some people have been alarmed : yet I think the argument quite innocent. It cannot possibly do any good : and I trust it will as certainly do no harm.

It is remarkable, that in the passage above about the deluge the author speaks of people's not believing *the important era*. Now there are persons in the world, who may think, that there is something artful in this manner of expression. They may imagine, that it is used by way of subterfuge, that if he should be hard pressed about this history, there might be some room to escape. For many people doubt about the time of an occurrence ; and yet believe the event. But this is an idle surmise : and we may fairly acquit the author of any such mean purpose. It is plain at first sight, that he takes the fact, and the *era* of the fact, for one and the same thing : and time and circumstance are esteemed synonymous. It is certain (I know not how truly) that we are apt in general to make a material distinction between them. We are taught to think, that an event, and the date of the event, convey two distinct ideas. Whichever side may be in the right, the inquiry is certainly curious : and deserves to be prosecuted. To be therefore certain of the truth, I applied to an honest countryman, one Sam Joel, in my neighbourhood, that I might have, not a learned, but a plain and rational solution of the question. Pray, says I, honest Sam, do not you believe, that there is some difference between a man and a month : between sheepshearing and the tenth of June ? Why really, Sir, says he, I do not quite see, what you drive at. Why then, says I, take it in another light. Do not you think

think my Lord Mayor is different from my Lord Mayor's day? Ay master, says he, to be sure: as different as a townbull from a turnip. I mention this, because I think arguments taken from unsophisticated reason are far more forcible, than those which are framed by art and logic: and even than those, which are founded upon non-experience.

The author in speaking of Berofus, Manetho, and other ancient writers, treats them as mere romancers: and says, that their evidence concerning the Deluge *amounts to precisely nothing*. Even Strabo and Diodorus are esteemed little better, than the authors of the Arabian Tales. Now I must confess, that before this impeachment of their credibility, I had a great prejudice in their favour: and thought, that much light might be derived from their histories. When I read in Berofus, that there had been a just person, much favoured by the Deity, who was forewarned of a deluge: and at the same time ordered to build a large ark or float: that he accordingly constructed such a machine, and inclosed in it his family together with animals of every denomination: that the flood came; and the ark for a season was lifted up by the waters: that this person at times sent out birds to know the state of the earth: that some of them returned in the same manner as they went out, having found no *resting place for their feet*: others at last came home with their feet stained with ooze; which afforded him knowledge, that the waters were in some degree subsided: that the ark at last settled upon a high mountain in Armenia, where the persons inclosed first made their exit: and from whence some of them came afterwards to Babylonia: I say, when I read these occurrences, I could not help thinking, but that this account was very similar to the description given by Moses; and that it afforded strong evidence

dence to the truth of that history. But the Author has before observed, that whoever *departs* from the sacred writings, and adopts *Pagan authorities* must necessarily *shake the venerable fabrick to its foundations*. He moreover assures us, that this Babylonish history must amount to nothing: for Babylonia was a flat, and liable to inundations.

In like manner when I considered the accounts given of Osiris, they affected me a good deal. He is said to have been a great husbandman, and to have taught people to sow corn, and to have been the inventor of the plough. He first planted the vine; and made drink of the juice of the grape; and was esteemed an universal benefactor. It is said of him, that he was shut up in an ark to avoid a deluge; and the days of his ingress and egress were celebrated by the Egyptians at different parts of the year, and held very sacred. The time of his entering into the ark was precisely on the sixteenth day of the second month after the autumnal equinox, when the sun was in Scorpio: at the season, when the days are decreasing, and the nights growing long. These events were commemorated at different places: and Osiris was represented in a boat; and thus carried about in procession. As this history coincides in so many particulars with the account given by Moses, it appeared to me of great consequence. But the learned author sets it intirely aside: for he says, that Egypt was all a flat, and liable to inundations: and we cannot write with any degree of probability about a flood in a country, which is liable to be overflowed. He adds farther, *To advance—as proofs of an universal deluge such ceremonies, as the processions of Egyptian priests with a boat and a strange figure, appears to be as unsatisfactory, as the demonstration of a general destruction by fire would have been from observations in the environs of Mount Vesuvius and Ætna.*

This

This seems to be well urged : and yet I am afraid it makes for the other side of the question. Sir William Hamilton, and some other curious observers, have formed an opinion, that the earth has undergone some great change by fire : and, what is remarkable, they draw their conclusions from the confines of these very mountains. They thought them the very best places for inquiry. Had they gone to Hindostan, they might probably have been better informed.

I do not therefore know what to think concerning this argument founded upon *high* and *low* : nor does it seem quite clear to me, that truth depends upon such chance circumstances. The author seems to imagine, that it is local : and that like the barometer, it rises and falls in proportion to its elevation. This puts me in mind of something similar in another place ; where he mentions language as the barometer of men's manners. p. 2. The thought is uncommon, and ingenious : and yet I think, if we go so far as to make language a barometer, we may with equal propriety stile reason an air-pump, and fancy a whirligig : In the mean time he has forgot, that the history of the deluge originated in Armenia, and about Ararat : which is as high ground, if that be of any consequence, as any about Delly or Lahor. But, as I said before, I know not how to persuade myself, that truth depends upon situation. The argument appears to me in some degree precarious. I remember, a few years ago, that an honest sailor was seduced into a house of ill fame ; and carried up to one of the Atticks in Drury Lane ; where he was plundered, and very near losing his life. The people concerned were tried for the robbery ; and the sailor in the course of examination was among other things asked, how he could suffer himself to be

be decoyed up three pair of stairs. Lord, Sir, says he, I thought there was as much honesty up three pair, as up two: I knew no difference.—He seems to have reasoned well: and I should think, that the converse of his argument may be fairly admitted. For I should imagine, in respect to the present question, that there was as much truth on the ground-floor as in the garret: in the vale of Escher as upon Teneriffe. But the learned author is of a different opinion: for he thinks, that truth cannot come from a flat. He therefore imagines that the man in the boat has no more to do with the deluge than the man in the moon: and this, because the Nile rises; and people must necessarily have been lost in it. These emblems therefore and ceremonies all relate to drowned persons.

He now proceeds to a new head of inquiry. *The next point, in relation to the Cuthite or Amonian worship of the sun and fire, I shall consider with more attention: as the strongest arguments seem to spring from the subject to demonstrate the usefulness of the Arabic and Persian languages. To make the subsequent observations more intelligible, it will be proper to give two extracts from the author's preface; which will fully show the groundwork of his ingenious hypothesis. I wish, he had gone a little farther for the groundwork: but however—two extracts are accordingly given from preface p. 7. and 15; of my first volume: the first of which begins in the following manner.—It is necessary for me to acquaint the reader, that the wonderful people, to whom I allude, were the descendants of Chus, and called Cuthites, and Cuseans. They stood their ground at the general migration of families: but were at last scattered over the face of the whole earth, &c. At the close of these extracts he makes the following observations upon them. Thus has this learned gentleman created*
a people

*a people to fill up every chasm of high antiquity : and to account for all the phænomena of early population, history, and superstition. As the sacred writers afford no lights to trace the wanderings of this extraordinary family ; and as all the gleanings from profane tradition might with equal force in the same ingenious hands prove Confucius to be William the Conqueror : his proofs à priori seem to amount to nothing : the great weight of his evidence resting chiefly on the ground of etymological deduction. This is a very melancholy and very alarming account : I am got upon a lee shore ; and as the sailors say, how I shall claw off, I do not know. In the first place, in respect to the Cuthites, he tells me, that they are a people of my own creating. In this I must have been greatly deceived : for I really thought, that they were ready made to my hands. They were the sons of Chus : and seemed to occur very plainly in the Scriptures, and likewise in profane authors : where they are to be found under different appellations ; but particularly that of Ethiopians. We have been told from different writers—*Χες Αιθιοψ. Χες, εξ ου Αιθιοπες. Χες, εξ ου Χουσαιοι. Αιθιοπες ουτοι εισιν. *They are mentioned by Homer and Herodotus : and almost by every writer who treats of the history of nations. The account, which I gave of them, was I flattered myself, more full, than had ever been exhibited before. It is in a manner the basis of my system : and takes up the greater part of my work. However if the author was not apprised of this, it cannot be imputed to him for a fault : for if he read no farther than my 17 page of the preface, he cannot be expected to know any thing of the work itself. Though it must be confessed, that people, who criticise three bulky volumes, generally look beyond the introduction. But indeed he must have gone farther ;*
and

and though he only skimmed the surface ; yet he has done it with a very quick and sagacious eye ; as is manifest from what he has borrowed. What is strange, he says, that I have not only *created this people* ; but created them to fill up *every chasm of high antiquity*. He looks upon them as so many fagots at a muster : which are made substitutes for every absentee. Yet I do not see, how the Cuthite Ethiopians can be so aptly suited and in so general a manner. The Family of the Fagots are of all times ; and of all countries. They may fill up a gap either in the regiment of Provence or Picardy, in the Coldstream, or the Train-bands : or in the Immortals of Xerxes, and Darius. But the family of the Cuthites was more limited : They may not be so easily adapted to supply a chasm in the dynasty of Hou-Fang of China : or in the ancestry of Senacharib of Assyria, or of Bladud the son of Hudibras king of Britain : for there may have subsisted no relation nor connexion between them and these princes. The author denies not only the existence of this people, but also their dispersion : which latter circumstance is rather unnecessary. For if they never existed, I believe, it will be readily allowed, that they were never dispersed. *However, says he, as the sacred writings afford no light to trace the wanderings of this extraordinary family, &c.* Now I really thought, that the Scriptures did take notice both of the Cuthites, and of this event. It is said by Moses, that Chus begat several children and among them Nimrod, who built Babel. And it is farther said, that those, who built Babel, the friends, and associates of Nimrod, were dispersed : *The Lord—did scatter them over the face of the whole earth.* Genes. c. 11. v. 9. Still further traces we have of them in other histories. But the learned author will not allow of any such

such evidence ; nor my reasonings from it. For he says, *that all my gleanings from profane tradition might with equal force in the same ingenious hands prove Confucius to have been William the Conquerour : therefore my proofs à priori amount to nothing.* The conclusion is very extraordinary : for it was really hitherto a secret to me, that I had ever made use of this argument. But upon a nearer inspection it is plain, that the author takes the argument à priori to be a deduction from past events : and to consist, to use his own words, *in the gleanings from profane tradition.* This to be sure is contrary to the common notions of most logical writers. But upon this we must not insist : as systems change : and the mode of reasoning alters. The signification of words likewise varies continually. Do not, says a Physician of my acquaintance, disclose this ill news too abruptly to the lady : let it be opened to her by degrees. O, undoubtedly, says a spruce journeyman of an Apothecary ; I will do it, sir, in terrorem. By this he certainly meant *in the most mild and gentle manner.* It is therefore very idle to cavil about words : for if we arrive at the purport, it signifies little by what means. When a letter of importance comes to hand, who troubles himself, whether it be by the Dunstable bag, or his Majesty's courier ? I have therefore not a word to say against the argument à priori. If we then set these little niceties aside, we shall find the ultimate to be, that no foreign evidence is to be allowed. It is contraband ; and at best but a kind of smuggling : and attended, we are told, with no advantage. From whence this corollary seems naturally to follow : *The more we search, the less we know ; and truth depends not upon information.* But this, I believe, will not be allowed.

He

He is pleased to take notice of my ingenious hands, which it seems can make contradictions plausible. And here, gentle reader, you must for some time have seen, what I have perceived to my sorrow, that all those fine compliments made to me at the beginning have been long since evaporating; and are at last totally annihilated. To use the author's own words upon another occasion, *give them their full force, and they amount precisely to nothing*. I am said to be unfortunately led *by the ear and the eye*. The *penetration* so kindly mentioned turns out a penetration without insight. *The judgment* allotted me proves a series of fundamental mistakes: and the *new and informing light* is a mere ignis fatuus, by which I have deceived myself; and bewildered others. The whole is attended with *a warmth of fancy devoted to the marvellous*: and even this last compliment of *ingenuity*, though pleasing and consolatory, amounts to little: for it is represented as a kind of legerdemain, and scarcely preferable to that of Breslaw, or Comus. But let us turn from this disagreeable retrospect. The author adds, that *the great weight of my evidence rests chiefly upon the ground of etymological deduction*. This was far from my intention: and I thought, that the state of the case had been quite otherwise. Indeed at the end of my etymological inquiries I had the forecast to put in a caveat: and it was there mentioned that the history, which was to ensue, was quite separate and independent. And this, I believe, is evident to every body, who has considered what I have written. But here the author is justly to be acquitted, for, as I have observed before, if he never read my work, he cannot be answerable for the purport. He kindly adds, that *as this is the station, which he (the author of the Analysis) has chosen, it could have been wished—that*

G

the

the definitions of his elementary particles had been precisely fixed : that the languages, whence he has drawn the meanings, he has annexed, had been distinctly specified : and that no doubt had been left upon the reader's mind. I sincerely wish the same : but it is difficult to satisfy all the world. Some cannot see : others will not : and there are none so deaf as those, who will not hear. And here I must observe, that what I mention as a root, or element ; the learned author stiles a particle. This may be very proper : for, as I before observed, words are taken *in terrorem* ; that is in different acceptations. But it should seem, that this usage ought not to be indiscriminately followed : for with the same latitude the names of persons may be called prefixes : and titles stiled expletives : which would be an affront to those, who are blessed with them. As for verbs and participles they might dwindle to commas and semicolons. It therefore seems proper, that upon this point we proceed with some caution.

Before I quit this subject it is necessary to mention one or two circumstances, which have pretty much embarrassed me : as they are attended with consequences, which I cannot reconcile. The author speaking of the Cuthites, says, that they are an ideal people of my own creating, formed only to stop up a gap. A page or two before he takes notice of their worship, and tells us, *that the strongest arguments seem naturally to spring from this subject to demonstrate the usefulness of the Arabic and Persian languages.* Concerning the utility of these languages I make no doubt ; but how it can be proved from hence seems to me a paradox. For if there were no such people, as the Cuthites, there could not be such worship : and this demonstration must be founded on a mere negative ; a non-entity.

Again :

Again : if I am so fundamentally mistaken, as represented ; so led by the eye and the ear : how came the author to borrow so largely from me : for he has certainly copied a great deal ? And here I cannot help putting a query, as there is so much appropriated from me, whether it should not have been more openly acknowledged. I only just hint it among friends, whether it would not have had a better appearance to have declared it above board and immediately to the public. To be sure, something of this sort may be found in the notes at the end, where he says, that *he should be uncandid, if he did not acknowledge, that he had derived much information from writers, whom he had criticised ; and from none more than from Mr. Bryant, D'Herbelote, and Hyde.* In respect to my two associates, and to others, this may be sufficient. But as he has translated me more, than he has any other person ; and borrowed from me far more largely than from others, it appears to my judgment, that something more was requisite. It cost me much labour to give an account of the Argonautic Expedition, and in making my observations upon it : and I believe a more particular and copious history of it was never exhibited before. The whole of this nearly to the amount of four pages the author has adopted ; and for the most part in my own words. Many other extracts of consequence are also taken from me : and this without any immediate notice, that such extracts are borrowed. It may perhaps be said, that if I had read my author, or read him with any attention, I should have seen a reference to a note, where such intimation is given. And now upon a nearer inspection I do see at the close of the paragraph an almost imperceptible letter, which denotes such a reference. But why is this information placed at the end of the treatise, and trans-

ferred to a note? When the author in polite terms calls me to an account my name stands boldly exposed to all the world: and is repeated through several pages. Should he not, when he borrowed from me, have introduced me in the same manner? He might have made his acknowledgments openly in so many words: or have printed the passages in italics. Many readers do not turn to notes: so that he will have the credit of the observations: if any credit there be. Or if they do turn to the place, it will afford them no great light. My name is mentioned: but whether to good or bad purpose cannot be seen. Much less can it be known how much or how little is borrowed. Sometimes my name is not at all mentioned: at other times it is so lost in a crowd of other authors, that it is impossible to know, from whom the series of evidence^{*} is taken. All this I mention for the sake of my learned friend: for the whole to me is of little consequence: it stands me very little in stead, whether I am placed in front, or in rear, or reduced to a fagot at a muster. And yet after all, I do not know, whether I am not too delicate in finding fault with this new mode of writing, where all additional notices and obligations are placed by themselves at the end of the book. It certainly preserves the text from being overloaded; and the author has acted with great propriety in presenting his lighter fare, and entremets immediately to our option: and placing, what is more gross and substantial at a distance. He knew well, that at polite tables, the chine and furloin are ever banished to the sideboard. His manœuvre in respect to the disposition of his evidence is like that of a great general, who besides a forlorn hope has always a corps de

^{*} See p. 33. 45. 46. 68. 69. 73. and at the end of the *Treatise*, Notes to p. 8. 68. 69. 84.

reserve behind in case of any exigency. This consists often of borrowed troops, and foreign soldiers, in whom however he may perhaps place more confidence, than in his own: and whose merits and services he very properly takes to himself. This method of removing things so far backward prevents also a deal of interruption: as at this distance the notes may be left to be read at last; or not read at all. It above all things adds to the uniformity of the page, which is spoiled by having notes at the bottom. And in these times, whoever would succeed, must address himself as much to the eye, as to the understanding. And though it may be usual to place Debtor first, and per contra Creditor afterwards; yet it is certainly in this instance better to bring creditor a priori forward; and debtor a posteriori behind. It is of no disservice to the reader: and ten times more pleasing to the writer: for *nemo videt id manticæ, quod a tergo est*: which must be esteemed an aphorism of great truth. The purport of it is this: that all bonds and obligations are cancelled, when they are *applied behind*. I do not therefore see, why we may not place some of our chief intelligence in the rear, just as on ship-board they carry lights in the poop. Here it is said, that Scoggan made enquiry, when he was presented with an horse. He lifted up the tail, and peered under it, as thinking this the sure place to find out his age and excellence. What success he had, is not mentioned. Thus much, I think, is certain, that we may by a fair analogy copy him. Our learned author has indeed done it: and where Scoggan searched for the qualities of his horse, he refers us for his obligations to his friends.

I come now to those elements, the *Radices amaræ*, which my kind opponent cannot digest. And yet at the close he says more in favour of

them, than he ever designed, or I expected. However the first setting off is not so gracious. One great endeavour of our learned author, is to trace to his Cuthites the origin of solar and igneous worship: and in order to fix his theorem he brings forward a number of particles, which, he says, in ancient times signified the sun, or fire. As he seldom mentions however, in what particular idiom they were received in those senses; doubts naturally arise. To the sun, as a mere astronomical body, or to the fire, as a simple element, few of them appear to bear the most remote relation, and in any other sense, descriptive of them, as objects of adoration, they might with equal propriety be adduced to authenticate the worship of the Egyptian onion, the druids oak, or the great Arabian stone devil in the valley of Mounah. What a sad reverse I am obliged to experience here! What is become of that penetration, judgment, ability, learning, informing light, and ingenuity, with which I was blessed before? How do the fairest flowers fade, and laurels wither! We have in the foregoing a heavy charge: and it consists, we find, principally in my bringing forward particles to fix a theorem: and this in order to shew, that these particles denoted the sun or fire: which however have no more relation to the astronomical sun, or fire, than an onion, or the devil. And I am farther blamed for not mentioning the idiom of these particles. In other places the author complains, that he cannot find out, to what language I allude: and yet, what may appear strange, without his knowing either idiom or language, he determines upon their signification; and tries to prove me fundamentally in the wrong. At other times he seems acquainted, not with one, but many languages, to which he supposes them to relate. Of forty radicals one half at least do not appear to approach the senses, he has given them. Whilst
 misled

misled by his ear and his eye, he has fancied analogies, which the languages will not bear. But I want to know, how he proves this : and by what standard he proceeds. Why he tries them by the Arabic and Persian languages : and if they do not accord, he thinks, that they are necessarily wrong. This surely is a very severe test : yet contrary to his purpose, I think it will prove greatly in my favour. For there is part of the allegation above very remarkable, and to which it will be worth our while carefully to attend. It is there said of the radicals produced by me, *half at least* do not come up to the meaning, which I assign. From hence we must necessarily conclude, that the remainder do answer, and come up to the meaning. As he mentions *half at least*, we will for charity's sake throw a small weight into the lighter scale to bring it to an equipoise ; and suppose them in round numbers half. And if this really be the case, I will compromise the affair, and gladly give up the other half without any dispute : for this concession is sufficiently in my favour. But this is not all. Many have thought that these elementary words, of which I gave a specimen, were merely ideal : the offspring of fancy. Now the author tells us, that they are almost all to be found in the Arabian and Persian languages : and nearly half in the acceptation, which I have given them : which is a circumstance of great consequence to me. He accordingly gives an interpretation of them : and he adds, *that nothing more shews the usefulness and antiquity of those languages, than the unconstrained meanings—for almost every radical produced by this gentleman* (the Author of the Analysis) *for the basis of his system. Could this be the effect of chance?* p. 115. With my system, as I have before observed, he does not seem to be truly acquainted : for it is founded upon very dif-

ferent principles. But in respect to what precedes, thus much is certain ; that if the greater part of these radicals are to be found, where he asserts ; *chance* could have nothing to do with it. For it was impossible for me at a hazard, without any knowledge of those languages, to have invented a series of terms, which are so happily found in them. And if it at all makes for the author's opinion ; it likewise makes for me, and confirms mine. If then near half of these ancient terms occur in the sense, which I allot to them : the other half, depend upon it, will be verified by other persons, and in different tongues. For it is a severe test to try a set of ancient terms by one or two languages only ; and such as are still in use : as if there were any language upon earth that had not suffered a change in an interval of between three and four thousand years. If then he allows, that almost all of them are to be there found, and near half in the sense, which I have given them ; that is sufficient for me. I cordially take him by the hand, and from my heart forgive him the imputation of my having made Confusius William the Conqueror : or of having either inclination or power to effect it.

The learned author has often asked from what dialect the roots, of which we have been treating are to be deduced : and in what *idiotom*, they are to be found. I have endeavoured to shew from the best evidence, which I could procure, that they were from the original language of mankind, antecedent to other tongues ; and even prior to dialects. But why does he put a question of this kind, when it is so fully answered by himself ? It is in a passage, where in a very generous manner he stands up in my defence against the invectives of the anonymous persons in the *Bibliotheca Critica* from Amsterdam. The writers of which for their
petulance

petulance he calls to a just account. Having spoken of my purpose, and referred to my preface, he adds: *Many other passages clearly explain his plan: and one of his chief objects is to develope ancient mythology from the obscurity, in which the Greeks had involved it, by corrupting the channels of derivation. He endeavours therefore to penetrate to the fountain-head of language: of which he considers the Greek only, as a remote stream. His ideas on this ground are judicious.—With what propriety then can these gentlemen triumph, and question his knowledge of the Greek, when he professedly goes to a higher origin for his etymologies.*

And now, good Sir, give me leave to address you more particularly; and to return you my sincere thanks for this noble defence. Some untoward thoughts arise from the premises: but I cannot be so cruel, as to give them vent. It is indeed with regret, that I am obliged at all to proceed. But I believe, that you yourself upon cool reflection must think that you have gone too far: for how could my words about *the modern Persic and Arabic* afford just grounds for your severe animadversions? You have certainly gone out of your way, and made an unnecessary attack: in which your zeal has carried you much beyond your mark. The work, which I ventured to produce to the world was the consequence of much study and great labour. This you have tried to ruin. Yet I have reason to think, that you never read it through: and those parts, which have come under your cognizance have been but partially noticed and little understood. You are unacquainted with the groundwork, upon which I proceed. What related at all to your department was but an inconsiderable portion of the whole; and of little consequence; as the historical part depended not at all upon it. But
you

you have exceeded your province, and suffered yourself to be seduced into an unknown region : of which you should have got some certain intelligence, before you had ventured to decry it. In the mean time you have run the hazard of hurting your own work by clogging it with so much extraneous matter. You have certainly been very laudably employed : and I make no doubt, but the world will be much indebted to your labours. The utility of your publication cannot be doubted : but, as I have before said, you have run the hazard of injuring it by that unnecessary detail, with which it is prefaced. Your book is chiefly calculated for the use of Persons in India, to facilitate their learning the language of the country. The intention therefore is manifestly good : and there is reason to believe, that the whole is well executed. But how does my work relate to it : and what are my opinions to the present purpose ? Be they right, or wrong, how can they concern a person at Patna or Chardanagora : at Decca or Bombay ? Certainly not in the least. Your forcing me upon the stage, and traducing my writings, can never be a recommendation of your own ; nor of any emolument to those, for whom they are designed. At the same time I should be sorry to have it a detriment : for I am not unacquainted with your labour and attention in the prosecution of your purpose : and so little does any illwill transport me, and so far am I from impeaching your work, that I sincerely think, it merits great encouragement, and should be in every library of consequence. It is with pleasure, I read at the close of your treatise, that you purpose to proceed farther. And as you say, that there are stores of Persic literature, it is to be wished that you would present the world with some of the histories from that country ; such as may appear the most ancient,

ancient, and of the greatest consequence. But at the same time let me beg of you not to be offended, if I give you a friendly caution. Believe me, my good Sir, you write too much in a hurry. Your goose-quill seems quite animated; and absolutely runs away with you. In consequence of this you often in a long-winded sentence forget the point in view, with which you set out. You indeed terminate boldly and roundly: but, though there is a great deal said, yet there is little expressed. Let us take for an instance the very beginning of your dissertation: p. 1. where you are speaking of *the manners of men*. These, you say, *must ever form an interesting inquiry*: a point, which we will not dispute. You then proceed upon the same head, and tell us—*In every age and climate they (the manners of men) display a wonderful diversity of character: and exhibit a picture so variously coloured, that we are convinced by experience alone, that the great original of the whole is man*. But surely you must be very hard to be convinced, if this be the case: for to me the affair seems self-evident. If the manners of men exhibit a picture, let the picture be as various, as you please; yet it must originate in man. There is no need of any train of inferences, nor a series of experimental knowledge, to convince us of this: for the whole, as I said before, is self-evident: no axiom can be plainer. In like manner the passions of men may be said to exhibit a picture: but that picture must have the same object for its original, as the passions, which it describes. The countenances, and features, of men may also afford a picture: and a very ridiculous one, if they are properly chosen, and contrasted; as we find them to have been in many instances by that ingenious artist Callot. But who upon seeing those groups of chins and noses and blubber lips ever doubted, to
 what

what being they belonged ? who ever waited for a long experience to find out, *that the great original of the whole is man ?* In short, if I may speak my mind, you seem to be rather too rhetorical ; and do not sufficiently regard logic ; a grain, or two, of which is of great consequence. You likewise make use of a figure common among modern writers, which an ingenious and learned friend of mine calls *the suspended progression*. It consists in making great advances without getting a step forward. A person seems to be carried on ; yet after a little hurry of spirits, and a few giddy evolutions, he is dismissed just, where he set out. Nothing can better explain it than the operation of the *Catulus culinarius*, *five canis εν περιτροχιω* *Bathoniensium* : which we find thus expressed by the poet.

— Orbiculo fertur revolutus eodem :
Progrediturque retro præceps, scanditque de-
orsum.

Permit me likewise to advise you to avoid in your preliminary discourses all extraneous matter : and above all things not to meddle with the writers of Greece. If you remember, you call me to a severe account for my boldness in speaking of the modern Persic : and I must own myself to have been an unfortunate delinquent. You say very rightly, *that there appears an impropriety in any person's condemning what he does not understand*. This leads me to a quere, which I forgot to make : and which with your permission I will mention now. You apply very familiarly to various Grecian authors ; and give your opinion about them, as if they were your intimate acquaintance. But be pleased, my good Sir, to tell me ingenuously, did you ever read five lines in any of them : or are you at all acquainted with the language, in which they

they wrote. I am sensible, that you speak with great ease of Strabo, Diodorus, and Plutarch: and you treat the more remote historians, such as Berosus, Abydenus, Sanchoniathon, as if you had personally known them. But familiarity does not prove acquaintance. It is a common thing for people to pretend to a correspondence with persons of the first rank: and to claim an intimacy, where they are the greatest strangers. I remember being formerly in some neighbouring gardens, when a noted empirick was haranguing a large circle of his ragged admirers, and recommending his pill. Many coaches with people of consequence passed by: but none unnoticed. To some he bowed: to others he kissed his hand: and to several he only nodded and smiled. Among others there came one carriage more splendid than the rest with a ducal coronet: which happened to be empty. But that did not signify. The doctor availing himself of the opportunity pulled off his hat; and made a most respectful bow. Then recovering himself with a smile, *You see, says he, that I know him: and I know them all. They are my fast friends, every mother's son of them, I can assure ye, my boys.* And yet there was reason to think, that he did not so much as know the man upon the coach-box. I mention this to shew, that there may be great familiarity without the least acquaintance.

You favour the Persian historians; and perhaps very justly. Yet I sometimes have apprehended, that you may hurt your own cause by the principles, upon which you try to establish it. For when you contrast the Persian writers with those of Greece, you seem to found their merit on mere negatives; which some may look upon as capital deficiencies. You accordingly tell us p. 42. 3. that there is no mention made of Cyrus the Great;
nor

nor of Croesus : nor of the kingdom of Lydia being annexed to that of Persia. There is moreover no account of Smerdis Magnus ; nor of Darius the son of Hystaspes : nor does the name of Cyrus the younger occur in the catalogue, which you give. Consequently the expedition under Clearchus, and the return of the ten thousand under Xenophon are not to be found. *Not a vestige*, say you, *is to be discovered of the famous battles of Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis, Platea, or Mycale* : all which, I fear, will not make in favour of your historians. As they are therefore silent about so many events, pray, what information is there, for which we may be beholden to them ? Why they tell us, you say, p. 45. that the Grecians so far from having had any advantages over the Persians were in reality tributaries to them ; and their states under contribution : p. 45. That Philip of Macedon was likewise dependant upon the same people : that he had been defeated in Macedonia by Darius ; and payed annually *a thousand golden eggs*. p. 49. Lastly, what is very extraordinary, and little thought of, that Alexander the Great was a Persian, the son of Darius Codomannus : the same prince, whom he defeated, and succeeded. *ibid.* After having mentioned these great contrarieties, you try with much skill to balance accounts ; and seem at last to come to this compromise : viz.—That you lean towards the Persian detail in respect *to the general idea* : but *in many circumstances you incline to the Greeks*. p. 52. Upon this determination I shall make no comment : much less shall I presume to say any thing to its disadvantage. For I am determined to observe the golden rule, which you have been pleased to lay down—that *there is an impropriety in a person's condemning what he confessedly does not understand.*

You have mentioned *my novel ingenuity*; and that *I shew a warmth of fancy highly prepared for every thing marvellous*. Now this is the very quality, which I have all along admired in you: and it is cruel to censure me, where I give you commendation. For your fort is certainly the marvellous. Nobody deals oftener, or more happily, in extraordinary narrations than yourself. One instance of this may, I think, be seen in your account of the library of a particular Arab grammarian, whose dictionaries alone came to sixty camels load. Now a camel's burden according to Shaw is seven quintals, or hundreds: at which rate the quantity of dictionaries amounted to twenty-one tun. If the man's learning was equal to his library, Aristotle must have been a fool to him.

Permit me to quote from you another instance of the wonderful in the history of Emir Ismael, who could not discover the treasure of Amron Leïs. N. p. 150. 2. It seems, that *one of the emir's female slaves, undressing to bathe on the terras of the palace, laid down her girdle, set with large rubies on a white cloth. A hungry kite, observing, and supposing the red stones to be bits of meat, pounced upon the girdle, and carried it off*. Nota bene. These rubies, which the slave wore, must have been very large to have been taken by a bird of prey for bits of meat: and I should have thought, that a kite was by nature too sagacious to have been thus deceived. When Dr. John Baldero was master of a college in Cambridge, he one day found his staircase very much dirtied; and taxed a scholar with it: who told him, that it was done by the raven in the court. Ay, ay, says old John, I guess, what sort of a raven did it: it was a two-legged raven. He would probably have stiled this a two-legged kite. I dare say it was one of John Baldero's breed.

breed. But I am wrong to interrupt the story. *The bird carried off the girdle. The damsel instantly gave the alarm, to the guard: and a number of horsemen were dispatched to keep the kite in view: who dropt it after a long pursuit: when it fell into a well. A man was immediately let down; who discovered in the side a large cavity, where a vast number of chests had been lodged, which proved to be the very treasure, which the emir had been in quest of; and amounted to four millions sterling.* This is the first time, I believe, that a body of horse was sent after a kite: and though the horses of Persia are very fleet; yet it is extraordinary in a long pursuit that they should be able to keep up with a bird so swift, which had likewise got some minutes the start of them. But the most surprising circumstance is, as the aperture of a well cannot be above a yard or two in diameter, that in so wide a range the kite should so exactly hit this mark: and of all places in so large a circuit let the girdle drop into this well. And last of all, which crowns the whole, that here should be the long sought for treasure, worth four millions sterling. We see here a wonderful concurrence of circumstances: and there are people, who will think, that they approach very near to the *marvellous*.

The story, p. 5. concerning the envoy, who was sent to the Tobba of Arabia, is equally extraordinary and entertaining. The prince, it seems, upon the envoy being introduced said to him, T'heb, *be seated*. But this, in the dialect of the person spoken to, unluckily signified—*precipitate yourself*: which proved an unfortunate circumstance. For the poor envoy, with a singular deference for the orders of his sovereign, went and threw himself from the wall of the castle, and broke his neck. Now the commands of princes ought without doubt to be heeded:

heeded: yet I believe in this case few would have shewn such *singular deference* at so sudden warning. One should think, that a person would have hesitated a little, and made some small inquiry ~~how~~ before he had ventured all for nothing. In later times a sensible man may have shewn a mistaken regard; and have been led into an error: but hardly into one so fatal, as that mentioned above. However there have been facts somewhat similar: and as nothing sets off a history to such advantage, as its parallel, accept what follows by way of illustration: for the precise truth of which I will not vouch: but give it you as I receive it. The person concerned is supposed to have been, like the man above, an envoy: one, who resided here in the reign of Queen Elizabeth: but of what country is not said: though from his great politeness some judgment may perhaps be formed. He is represented as very infirm, and gouty: and at the same time troubled with a painful retention. The MSS. in which he is mentioned, describes him in the following manner. *He was a very aged, and a very costive Lord: and so marred in his knees and in his ancles with the gout, that he could scant stand. One day, when he was in Privy Chamber, the Queen's Majestie noting his infirmities, sayd unto him: Good my Lord, I wish, that you could procure yourself a stool. He not truly apprehending her Grace's meaning through default of language, but thinking of his private malady, went incontinent home: and took so many laxatives, enemas, and cathartics, that he was well nigh killed. And though they gave him Hippocrass, and many cordial apozems, yet from Allhallow-tide to Saint Swithin his bowels were like a bladder. Nor did they recover themselves in a year, they were so angered and aggrieved.* Whatever mistake may have been made, we see here the utmost complai-

H

fance:

fance : and this too, let me tell you, in very critical circumstances. Nothing could be more proper, than the regard shewn to the supposed good wishes of a princefs ; whose wishes were esteemed equal to commands. But I must confess, when a regard of this sort is extended to hanging or drowning, or to breaking one's neck, it seems to be carried rather too far. And whatever sense of duty a person may entertain, yet I should imagine, that he would think twice, before he implicitly obeyed : for a leap down a precipice is no jesting matter. In good truth, if I may be allowed to speak freely, histories of this sort are very little superior to those of that respectable lady, Mother Goose. On this account I should imagine, that in your future publications they had better be omitted, lest the Persians should be esteemed as great fablers as the Greeks. As to the account (p. 147. notes) of the Nim Iuzé, this I allow to be curious ; and it is of a different cast. I beg therefore to repeat it in your own words, for I am far from having any thing to say to its disparagement. *One of the most singular creatures (in Arabia) is the Nim Iuzé, or Nim Cbeir. It is supposed to be a human figure split in two : the male being the right half, and the female the left. They have of consequence half a face, one eye, one arm, and one foot ; on which they run with incredible swiftness.* There is humour in this : and I only wish, that one of the halves had been sent after the kite, that stole the maid's girdle ; it would have beat the Persian scouts all hollow.

And now, good sir, give me leave in the most amicable manner to conclude. You took notice in a particular passage, that you thought it your duty to defend the merits of the Persian and Arabian languages. You cannot but think me under an equal obligation to stand up for my own writings.

I hope therefore, that what I have said, will be taken in good part. You have certainly in some instances nearly cancelled the kind compliments, which you made me : but in general you have behaved with very great politeness. Your standing up in my defence against the persons who traduced me abroad, does as much honour to yourself, as to me: and lays me under an obligation, which I shall be always ready to acknowledge. Though I may have smiled at your borrowing from me, and placing your references in the rear : yet I am very happy, that there was any thing worth your taking. Indeed I am under other obligations to you beside the above. As there are several copies of my Analysis still remaining in the bookseller's hands, nobody writes against me, but what some of them go off. Mr. Barrington did me the honour to call me to an account; I suppose not less than twenty copies went upon the occasion. The Dean of Exeter made some kind strictures both upon me and Mr. Barrington : this carried off about the same number. Anonymous benefited me by about fifteen. Another Anonymous ten: Ditto eight. My friends of Amsterdam not quite so many. When I was in town some weeks ago Mr. Elmsly (whose zeal for his author can never be sufficiently admired) took me aside, and shewed me the very Dissertation, upon which we have been dwelling so largely. It came out, says he, but yesterday; and I sold two of your copies last night; and one this morning. He then added with a whisper,—*If they abuse you much longer, we must have a third edition.*

F I N I S.

I hope therefore that what I have said will be
taken in good part. You have certainly in former
instances nearly excelled the best commentators
which you have met but in general you have not
hated with very great politeness. Your handling
of my defence against the persons who traduced
me abroad, does at much more than you had at to
me; and says me under an obligation, which I
shall be always ready to acknowledge. I thought
may have, I believe, been more than me, and
placing your references in the margin; yet I am very
happy that there was any thing worth your taking
notice of. I am under other obligations to you besides
the above. As there are several copies of my Anti-
Jews still remaining in the bookseller's hands, no
body writes against me, but what some of them
go off. Mr. Huntington of the O. S. has been to
call me to see a copy of the book. I have told them
twenty copies were sent to the Dean
of Exeter, upon the request of Mr. B. and
some number. As the book is so
fitted. As the book is so fitted.
My friends of Antiquity are doing so many.
When I was in town last week ago Mr. B. (who
(whole read for his master) was very
admitted) took the book, and showed me the very
Dissertation, upon which we have been speaking to
largely. It came out, I say, not yesterday; and
I told two or three copies last night; and one this
morning. It is then added with a whole. —
I hope you will be happy to see it.



2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1